

Appendix

Wheat Price Boost No Cause To Increase the Cost of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, recently the president of the American Bakers Association expressed the belief that, in view of higher support prices for wheat, bread prices would probably have to be increased 1 cent a loaf. There is no reason in the world why any bread price increase should be attributed to the new wheat program. I am happy to see that an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, August 29, discussing this matter, concluded;

Neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1961]

EXPLANATION FOR CONSUMERS—WHEAT PRICE BOOST NO CAUSE TO INCREASE THE COST OF BREAD

(By Julius Duschka)

Should consumers blame farmers for the proposed penny-a-pound increase in the price of bread?

And is it true that in these days of billion-bushel wheat surpluses there actually is a shortage of high-quality wheat which millers need for flour?

These two questions were raised last week when Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman conducted a long-distance argument with E. E. Kelley, Jr., president of the American Bakers Association.

DISPUTED INGREDIENTS

As most consumers stood by understandably puzzled, Freeman and Kelley disputed the ingredients which are responsible for an expected rise in bread prices.

The argument began when Kelley, who operates a large bakery in Lakeland, Fla., said that "it will be little short of a miracle if bread prices are not increased in the near future."

He cited an increase in wheat support prices and a shortage of high-quality wheat as among the factors calling for higher bread prices.

Kelley said increases in flour prices that bakers are already paying will add \$60 million a year to their operating costs. This amounts to the baking industry's total profits last year, Kelley added.

He also said that a recent increase in Agriculture Department price-support levels for nonfat dry milk, an important commercial baking ingredient, added another \$8 million to the industry's annual costs.

Wheat support prices will go up next year under a new farm program passed by Con-

gress this summer and approved by wheat producers just last week.

In exchange for a 10 percent reduction in wheat acreages, farmers will be guaranteed an average price of \$2 a bushel by the Government, compared with \$1.79 this year.

Farmers will also be paid for the land taken out of wheat production. The payments will vary from 45 to 60 percent of what the farmers could have earned if the diverted acres had been planted in wheat.

But this program will have no direct effect on the price of wheat harvested this year.

There has been no significant change in the price of No. 2 Hard Red Winter wheat, which has been selling for about \$2 a bushel. This is the quality wheat that millers need for flour.

As for the supplies of this wheat, the Agriculture Department maintains that they are more than ample.

DROUGHT EFFECTS

The Hard Red Spring wheat crop, which millers also want, is estimated at only 128 million bushels this year, which is about 12 million below the domestic needs of 140 million bushels.

But there is a surplus of Hard Red Winter wheat of almost a billion bushels. In addition there is a stored surplus of nearly 200 million bushels of spring wheat.

The United States needs only 257 million bushels of the winter wheat. The shortage of spring wheat is due in part to the drought centering in Montana and North and South Dakota.

Not all of the surplus wheat is of high quality, but combined with the expected 1961 Hard Red Winter wheat crop of more than 1 billion bushels, it should furnish enough top-grade wheat to meet the needs of bakers.

The protein content of the 1961 crop is about 1 percent less than in 1960, but this year's wheat is considered equal to last year's in protein quality.

The farmer gets only 14 percent of what the consumer pays for a loaf of bread, and this figure includes the cost of the butter and milk in the bread as well as the wheat.

The Agriculture Department says that the average cost of a pound loaf of bread last year was 20.3 cents, of which the farmer gets 2.8 cents.

The share received by the baker and wholesaler, who usually are the same person or company, was 11.9 cents, or 59 percent of the total.

The retailer got 3.4 cents, or 17 percent, and the miller received seven-tenths of a cent, or 3 percent. Other costs amounted to 1.5 cents.

The farmer's share of the cost of a loaf of bread has decreased from 25 to 14 percent during the last decade, while the price of bread has increased from 13.5 cents a pound loaf to 20.3 cents.

The baker-wholesaler's share has gone up from 44 to 59 percent, the retailer's has remained the same at 17 percent, and the miller's has decreased from 5 to 3 percent.

OTHER COSTS RISE

Not all of the costs are profit, of course. Labor costs, for example, have been continually increasing, as have other costs involved in production and distribution of bread.

But where do all of these figures leave the consumer, except holding a bag containing a higher priced loaf of bread?

The figure would seem to indicate that neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Reshaping Lives Is Daily Business of Court's Probation Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Washington Star on August 21, 1961.

This article tells of the outstanding work performed by the municipal court probation office toward the rehabilitation of alcoholics in the District of Columbia. The record of that office, under the guidance of Robert J. Conner, Sr., has attracted the attention of many large cities throughout the country who have struggled with the problem of rehabilitation of alcoholics.

The fine work, progress, and savings to taxpayers that have been achieved through this humanitarian and realistic program in the Nation's Capital, is deserving of national attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1961]

RESHAPING LIVES IS DAILY BUSINESS OF COURT'S PROBATION OFFICERS

(By Dana Bullen)

Municipal court probation officers, engaged in the daily business of reshaping lives, have to be masters of both the soft and hard sell.

They prefer to use the soft sell when possible.

"You've got to let these people feel you will be their friend, if they will let you," said Probation Director Robert J. Conner, Sr.

"The minute you've got their confidence," he said, "you've got the battle (of rehabilitation) half won."

This type of friendly concern for a convicted man's problems is one of the main tools used by Mr. Conner and his 10 probation officers.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR ISSUE

It leads to many things that could hardly be anticipated on the day a judge first places a convicted man or woman on probation.

For example, Mr. Conner recalled his first case as a probation officer—18 years ago.

A Northeast Washington woman was convicted of stealing food. Mr. Conner found she lived in a basement with a dirt floor and had active tuberculosis.

He helped the destitute woman obtain hospitalization for herself and a temporary foster home for her small baby. Eighteen months later, the woman was released as cured.

Even now, years later, the woman occasionally comes to the probation office to let Mr. Conner know how she is doing—and to say thanks.

"She knows she would have been dead in a few months if she'd been left in the place where I found her," he said.

Or take another case.

ORDERED LONG WALK

This man, call him Jones, was convicted of drunken driving. When he came to the probation officer to be interviewed, he was drunk again. Jones was with his wife.

"I suggested to the wife that she drive the car home and let him walk," Mr. Conner said. Two hours—and 8 miles—later, the man was sober, and more receptive.

Jones, with the help of the probation staff and members of Alcoholics Anonymous, licked his drinking problem, Mr. Conner said.

The man hasn't been back to municipal court. He's been too busy leading a useful, productive life. Jones, Mr. Conner said, is now a grade 15 in the Government.

KEEN ON PROGRAM

This story points up one of Mr. Conner's main ideas about rehabilitation. Solve the liquor problem, he feels, and you're miles ahead in solving all the other problems.

Under Mr. Conner's guidance, the probation office in 1958 set up an alcoholic rehabilitation unit to try to keep drunks sober and let other probation officers handle criminal cases.

The special unit, headed by Edward W. Soden, has worked with 7,701 persons during the last 33 months. Of these, 57 percent were not arrested for intoxication again.

COUNSELING PROMOTED

Another of Mr. Conner's beliefs is that a successful probationer needs a paying job. All but 33 of the 669 men and women on probation at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30, were employed.

During the year, probation officers referred 304 probationers to employment counseling services. In the last 4 months, they actually found jobs for 47 persons.

The benefit to the District is substantial. In taxes alone, officials estimated, probationers with jobs paid in \$349,638.

These taxes alone exceed the yearly appropriation for operation of the entire probation office. For fiscal year 1962, the allocation for the office is \$124,220.

But money is not the main thing Mr. Conner and his staff look at. Every day, men and women pass through the probation office who would otherwise be in jail cells.

The record, naturally, is not all successes. Some probationers, at least at first, wish the probation officer—and his rules—would just leave him alone.

That's where the hard sell may come in. A probationer who won't follow the rules, or won't cooperate, can be jailed, although it's usually a last resort.

RECORD IMPRESSIVE

Probation was revoked, on the recommendation of the probation office, in 105 cases last year. These might be considered the failures, but the percentage is low.

But the record of successes—the jobs found, the men kept out of jail, the tax savings, the salvaged lives—while impressive, is the result of an uphill fight.

In 1957, the Commissioners' Committee on Prisons, Probation, and Parole recommended 20 additional probation officers at municipal court, more clerical help, and better facilities.

Since then, one supervisor, four probation officers, and two stenographers have been added to the staff.

But, said Robert R. Estep, assistant probation director, probation officers still carry almost 90 cases each. This is roughly double recommended national standards, he said.

A lack of stenographers, according to an annual report released this month, requires probation officers to spend up to 50 percent of their time on clerical details.

Requested for fiscal 1962 in this month's annual report were two more stenographers and two additional probation officers. More space at municipal court is not now possible.

Johnson—Long Right Arm of American Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we Texans are proud, very proud, of the job that Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON as an American has done for our whole Nation. But our pride was never greater than it was when he entered Berlin and brought to that beleaguered city the courage and the reassurance that it needed in one of its darkest hours.

In his trip to Berlin, the Vice President was firm but not provocative; courageous but not belligerent. He handled himself with skill and with dedication to the best interests of the free world, and therefore, the best interests of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Waco News-Tribune.

[From the Waco News-Tribune, Aug. 24, 1961]

JOHNSON—LONG RIGHT ARM OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

One of the real turning points in the Berlin crisis was the visit of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Germany and West Berlin. While nobody outside the highest official circles knows exactly what he said to the free German leadership, the results speak for themselves.

German Chancellor Adenauer and West Berlin Mayor Willie Brandt, engaged in a political battle for the chancellorship of West Germany in elections scheduled September 17, needed a settling influence in the face of the sudden Communist action in sealing off the borders of East Berlin. JOHNSON settled them quickly, effectively, and in a way that strengthened the cause of freedom in this moment of tension and potential war.

It is obvious, even at the present level of Red-created crisis, that the Soviets do not want war in Europe. They could gobble up West Berlin in one quick bite if they wanted to risk a war. The trick is to deny them that quick bite without pulling down the nuclear holocaust which hangs over everybody's heads. A miscalculation or a misunderstanding amidst the taut confrontation on the border of East Berlin could start the shooting when nobody meant to start it. There was the prospect, in the German political slugging, that such a misunderstanding

ing might come about. This is what JOHNSON cleared up in his flying visit.

The Vice President spread another layer of firefighting foam in the southeastern Asia crisis a few months ago on another flying mission on behalf of the United States to an area that threatened to ignite a major conflict.

The entire Nation can be grateful, and Texans can be especially proud, over the increasing strength of the Vice President as the long right arm of President Kennedy and of the American people in a time when the Communists are doing their clever best to throw us off balance and sucker us into giving them an opening to grab up the resources of Western Europe and Japan.

The now familiar sight of JOHNSON handshaking with crowds of Africans, Asiatics, and Europeans tells only the surface part of what he is doing for his country. He is a born showman and knows how to get the crowds with him, but he also is politically sensitive, coldly realistic, and knows how to deal with the leadership of friendly and neutral lands in a decisive way. His role in the Kennedy administration grows larger every day because of his unique combination of talents, his tireless energy and his determination to give the country everything he has, wherever and whenever he can serve.

The Kennedy-Johnson combination is gaining stature steadily in grappling with the gravest threat our way of life has ever faced. We have dark and gloomy days ahead, crises to come that will test our nerves to the breaking point. But we have leadership we can trust and if we stand to the test stoutly, we may live to see the day of victory.

Stratford Asks Fallout Shelter Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Kennedy has courageously alerted the Nation to the need for greater civil defense efforts. His leadership has already resulted in wider public awareness of a national need for thought and for action.

Recently, Mayor George F. Dooley of the Borough of Stratford, Camden County, N.J., came to my offices to begin farsighted plans for his community. He and other borough officials met here to discuss built-in civil defense protection for new municipal buildings now in the planning stage. They were told by Defense officials that they were the first municipal officials to take this step.

An editorial in the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post of August 24 describes this visit and the importance of greater public awareness of the situation that we face. I am glad that the Camden Courier Post has commented so well on the action taken by the Stratford officials. Such awareness of the basic need for decisionmaking on all levels of civil defense activity is very necessary and most welcome at this time.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Stratford Asks Fallout Shelter Cash" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATFORD ASKS FALLOUT SHELTER CASH

Stratford has won national publicity by being the first community in the country to apply for Federal funds to help build public fallout shelters under a new civil defense program.

Stratford Borough officials, making the request of James H. Henry of the Defense Department's Operations Research Office at a meeting arranged by Senator WILLIAMS, were told by Henry they were the first in the Nation to do so. They are planning to build public fallout shelters under the municipal building and a new elementary school, and according to Mayor George F. Dooley, Jr., "want built-in civil defense protection in those buildings from the very beginning."

Senator WILLIAMS says he is convinced that a national fallout shelter program will be underway in the relatively near future. We would join him in complimenting the Stratford officials for getting in on or under the ground floor of such a program, if the metaphor is permissible.

Fallout shelters are perhaps the least controversial element of civil defense, and are a major part of the Kennedy administration's civil defense plan. Congress already has appropriated \$207 million for an expanded radiation shelter program—the one in which Stratford would participate. President Kennedy asked Congress on August 14 for \$73 million more for civil defense food and medical stockpiling programs.

The apparent strategy behind the revised civil defense policy is to convince Soviet leaders that Americans are ready to risk nuclear war, if necessary, to protect rights to access to West Berlin.

Actual physical preparations to withstand a nuclear attack can hardly be anywhere near completion by the time the Berlin crisis reaches its peak, presumably late this year. The marking and stocking of fallout shelters in existing office, industrial, school, and apartment buildings has a December 1962 target date. Such shelter areas, when readied, are supposed to provide reasonably adequate protection against fallout for one-fourth of the Nation's population, or about 46 million persons. Relocation of 126 million bushels of federally owned wheat from current storage sites to areas where food shortages might exist following an attack certainly will take many months. New storage facilities will have to be constructed in many of the 191 metropolitan areas slated for a share of the grain.

The most obvious means of rapidly increasing civil preparedness for the immediate period of international tension would be to encourage individual and communal protective measures. Stocking a 2-week supply of nonperishable food by each family and building of family fallout shelters would fit in this category. But the President so far has refrained from calling for construction of family shelters or for a Federal tax incentive to spur such construction. A major deterrent to such a call is the fear that it might cause undue public alarm.

There is some risk that a truly crash program on civil defense might be misinterpreted by both friend and foe. Initiation of an expanded shelter program, for example, might be viewed by an enemy as signaling a preemptive strike. A student of civil defense has written: "A massive shelter program initiated by either side would be a disequilibrating element in the balance of terror. With only ineffectual shelter measures the [people] of each bloc are in effect nuclear hostages of the other. Putting them under protective cover deprives the other side of its hostages in proportion as the cover is—or is thought to be—effective."

Whether fallout shelters offer any hope of saving millions of lives in the aftermath of a nuclear attack is itself a matter of debate. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified that it was "probably a reasonable estimate that the identification and marking of existing fallout shelters could, without additional effort, save at least 10 to 15 million lives in the event of a thermonuclear attack." One study concluded that a combined blast and fallout shelter program could reduce total casualties by at least 90 percent.

A more pessimistic view holds that any shelter program will become quickly outmoded by new weapons systems, that nuclear scientists underestimate the period of radioactive contamination, and that shelters negate any kind of positive reaction to attack by creating a rabbit warren psychology among the people. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, stated a year ago that he would rather spend money "on offensive weapon systems to deter the war in the first place."

The debate is bound to become more intense if the administration presses next year for a 5-year Federal-State-local shelter program to cost up to \$20 billion. Frank B. Ellis, new Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, is known to favor such an effort.

You Don't Have To Be Crazy—The Individual and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 21, 1961]

YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE CRAZY—THE INDIVIDUAL AND EDUCATION

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

U.S. Commissioner of Education Sterling McMurrin, speaking to the Harvard summer school on education administration, made a statement which, to my mind, reveals the hidden desire of the New Frontier to bring the education of our children under the control of the Federal Government.

Advocates of Federal aid to education angrily deny they seek dictatorial powers.

In my opinion, Federal control is explicit and implicit in every suggested Federal-aid bill we have considered.

At Harvard Mr. McMurrin said:

"Educational goals conceived only in terms of the individual welfare are no longer sufficient to insure the preservation of democracy in an age when continuing political, social and cultural crises place the Nation in deadly peril."

"Educational goals conceived only in terms of the individual welfare are no longer sufficient," says Mr. McMurrin. Is this not a demand for collectivization?

The individual, through personal development of whatever talents he possesses, has made this country what it is today.

Individuals produce progress, not the Federal Government. Individuals establish morality, not the Federal laws. Individuals select the national goals and aspirations, not the Congress. Individuals exhibit love and compassion, not the corporate state.

It is the Communists who maintain the people who live under their domination.

But the collectivists have failed miserably to achieve even the minimum of material well being for their subjects, and certainly there is no spiritual satisfaction for those who live under Communist doctrine.

Here in the United States of America on one-sixth of the world's real estate, a small fraction of the world's population, operating in a climate of individual freedom, has created more material wealth than the rest of the world combined.

Here we have stamped out starvation, something no totalitarian state has been able to accomplish.

Our citizens, under what McMurrin now discards as the old-fashioned concept of individual determination, have enjoyed greater educational opportunities than have been available to any other children in the world.

On what valid ground can the U.S. Commissioner of Education argue that the preservation of democracy depends upon the abandonment of our historic educational concept?

How can he suggest that we must now forget the welfare of the individual and direct our concern to the collective?

Freemen as responsible individuals created this Republic and have perpetuated it for our benefit.

I am confident Mr. McMurrin is no Communist, but I think he advocates this central control because, like so many social reformers, he has accepted central dictation as the only acceptable solution to the problems of the 20th century.

I would remind Mr. McMurrin, and all who believe in centralized control, that in modern times tyranny has commenced with regimentation in the classroom, with the removal of individual determination and with the substitution of mass or collectivist objectives.

How do you stand, sir?

Our Democracy of the 20th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have just returned from a meeting held last weekend by the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association. The 81st annual convention of this body of dedicated newspapermen was held at French Lick, Ind., and featured panel discussions of accomplishments of our new State and National administrations.

It was my privilege to discuss our work here in the Senate and its coordination with the White House and executive departments and to introduce four of my Indiana colleagues from the House of Representatives. It was also my privilege to hear discussions of the outstanding work being done by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh and his administration. We were pleased to have with us Mr. Richard Goodwin of the White House staff who spoke to us on world affairs at the luncheon of the editors.

All of this is indicative of the great interests of Hoosiers in the overriding issue of today—survival.

This year the Resolutions Committee of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association drafted an excellent report on "Our Democracy of the 20th Century."

I ask that the text of this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEMOCRACY OF THE 20TH CENTURY

The Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, in convention assembled at French Lick, Ind., August 26, 1961, by resolution and acclamation of its editor members, finds it appropriate to make the following report:

America has faced strong enemies during the 20th century.

In all cases, the hostile power has generated out of monolithic political systems, whose singleminded dedication was difficult to defeat.

And, according to these enemies, America was weak—hampered by an inefficiency which grows out of controversy and compromise. In such a role, it is hard for the enemies of our society to understand why we have been able to defeat them.

The amazing America of the 20th century has grown strong for precisely the reason that it was singleminded. Our patterns of "inefficiency are vital keys to the growth of our economy, our security, and the social well-being of our people.

Our nation could not ignore the changing world of the 20th century, but it insisted upon following its own system of change—a system which mirrors the ebb and flow of political opinion and action, shaped by the choices of a free electorate.

In areas of economy, security and social well-being, the courageous program of the Democratic Party has defined and developed unique methods of change which so puzzle our enemies. The progressive programs of the Democratic Party have resulted from decisions made by the electorate. It is significant that these programs have not been canceled, although the opposition party elected to office possessed the right and the opportunity to cancel them.

It is clear that peaceful, democratic progress, with its elements of controversy and compromise, has been the central factor in the development of a kind of power that dictators hate and fear.

It is also clear that this means of progress must be protected—and defended against every threat.

In 1960, the wisdom of the electorate again was vindicated when it chose Matthew E. Welsh to be Indiana's Governor. In making this decision, voters not only chose the principles of Democratic progress—but also the important principle of strength through change. In this respect, the voters feared that a particular Hoosier brand of singlemindedness had perpetuated itself long enough.

In spite of Governor Welsh's victory, political opinion in Indiana continues to be dominated by a single party. Central to this domination are party newspapers, which far outnumber those of rival opinion and exist as monopolies in many sections of the State.

As Democratic editors, we do not believe that Republican ideas are dangerous, in themselves, to America's 20th century system. After all, divergency in belief is the very core of the strength of this system.

It is because we believe in the need for continued controversies and divergencies, that Democratic editors must see themselves in roles of unparalleled importance in the future of Indiana and the Nation.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,

PAUL L. FELTUS,

Bloomington Star-Courier.

RICHARD G. INSKEEP,

Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.

JOHN A. WATKINS,

Bloomfield Evening World.

VIRGIL MCCLINTIC,

White County News.

Playing With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Herald Tribune, David Wise tells us the shocking story of what happens when children play with fire. In this case, one of the children is Richard Goodwin, Presidential assistant, who talked with Major Guevara, Minister of Industries of Cuba and a dangerous Communist. The estimates of the length of the conversation are from 20 minutes, by the Presidential press secretary's own admission, to 3 hours, according to the former Foreign Minister of Argentina.

What was Mr. Goodwin talking about? Why should he engage in a conversation with an avowed enemy of the American people, in the first place? If Mr. Goodwin doesn't have the judgment to determine what effect a Presidential assistant's conversation with a representative of the Communist movement has, he should be summarily dismissed or reassigned to some other, less sensitive field of endeavor. Isn't it time President Kennedy called in all of the do-it-yourself kits on foreign policy, which apparently he has passed out to his intimates?

The article by Mr. Wise follows:

KENNEDY DENIES PLAYING A ROLE IN

GUEVARA TALK

(By David Wise)

WASHINGTON.—A cocktail party conversation between an assistant to President Kennedy and Cuba's Minister of Industries, Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, has touched off a minor international incident.

The White House denied flatly yesterday that President Kennedy had any advanced knowledge of the talk between Richard N. Goodwin, deputy special counsel to the President, and Major Guevara at Montevideo August 16. Associate Press Secretary Andrew Hatcher termed the conversation "a casual meeting, completely accidental."

Monday night, Argentina's Foreign Minister, Adolfo Mugica, resigned in the wake of a political storm kicked up in that country after the cocktail party incident.

SENATORS TO CALL GOODWIN

Yesterday afternoon, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee announced it would question Mr. Goodwin about the affair. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate assistant majority leader, said the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs would call Mr. Goodwin for questioning at a closed meeting.

Senator HUMPHREY said Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, was trying to arrange the session to "explore what talks were had and what took place." He said it was not an investigation, but that the subcommittee wanted to be kept informed.

Mr. Goodwin had no comment, but White House sources said the conversation took place when the 31-year-old Presidential aid arrived at a cocktail party at the home of a Brazilian diplomat in Montevideo. Mr. Goodwin was one of several American officials attending the alliance for progress conference at nearby Punta del Este.

INVITED TO PARTY

He was said to have been preparing to retire for the night when he ran into friends at his hotel, who invited him to the party. There, he met Major General Guevara, a Moscow-trained expert in guerrilla warfare and an Argentine by birth who fought with Fidel Castro in Oriente Province.

Major Guevara is said to have approached Mr. Goodwin and launched into an explanation of Cuba's foreign policies that reflected the Castro government's propaganda line.

Last week, there were published reports that Major Guevara had put out "feelers" toward better relations between Washington and Havana. The White House discounted these reports at the time. The Presidential press secretary, Pierre Salinger, said the talk had "no political significance."

He added that it was "just a case of two men meeting at a reception, and one of them being polite enough to listen for a few minutes to some one he met at a party."

GUEVARA'S VERSION

Last Wednesday night in Havana, Major Guevara gave his version of the conversation. He said:

"I expressed our Cuban position that we are willing to talk, that we do not want to fight, that we want to remain within the Latin American system and that we demand the right to be just another country among countries with differing economic systems. It was a short, courteous and cold meeting and it was not important."

Mr. Mugica resigned as Argentine Foreign Minister apparently as a direct result of the cocktail party incident. The Argentine diplomat had told newsmen that the "Guevara and Goodwin conference in Montevideo, Uruguay, demonstrated that Cuba's Fidel Castro regime seeks better relations with the United States."

Argentine President Arturo Frondizi met with Major Guevara on August 18 and came under political fire for doing so. Mr. Mugica said he had told reporters about the Goodwin-Guevara talk to show Mr. Frondizi's meeting with Guevara was nothing more than "acting in the same line" as the United States.

OTHER VERSIONS

President Frondizi's conversation with the Cuban angered the military, and Mr. Frondizi made two nationwide broadcasts thereafter reaffirming Argentina's policy of "pro-Western, Christian and democratic character."

Mr. Mugica said Monday night he was resigning to avoid the slightest trouble between Argentina and a friendly country. Asked by reporters whether he was referring to the United States, he said, "Yes. When I made my declarations about the Goodwin-Guevara interview, I knew in unquestionable form what had happened at that interview, its duration of three hours and the fact that the personal representative of President Kennedy could not have spoken for 3 hours with the Cuban Minister without prior knowledge of his chief."

Questioned about this statement today, Mr. Hatcher said "neither the President nor Mr. Goodwin had any knowledge that Mr. Goodwin would speak with Che Guevara." He added the conversation lasted 20 to 25 minutes, and not 3 hours.

He said about 30 persons were present, and that "90 percent of the conference" was in Spanish, with several persons present acting as interpreters. He said the talk took place in the main room where the party was held, with other persons dancing and talking nearby.

Mr. Goodwin is a Latin American affairs specialist for the President and served on a preinauguration task force on Latin America. He has worked on the alliance for progress program and was a key speechwriter for the President during last fall's

election campaign. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School, former clerk to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter and was a staff assistant on a House subcommittee that probed rigged television quiz shows in 1959.

Keeping Our Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, increasing numbers of thoughtful citizens in my State, as in many others, are concerned by the apparent unwillingness of our Government to determine by thorough and impartial survey whether there is not some workable alternative to the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. As most Members are aware, this project will, if continued, flood some 9,000 acres of land belonging to the Seneca Indians by our treaty of 1794.

The Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress have not yet authorized the \$15 million requested by the administration for the continuation of the Kinzua Dam project. But the administration has made clear its intention that the project be continued. I believe that Congress should, at the very least, be in a position to assure our citizens that every reasonable alternative to the Kinzua Dam has been actively, adequately and impartially sought out and explored and that, in the final political decision on whether or not to proceed, the great moral questions involved in breaking a treaty have been fully and carefully weighed. Thus far, the American public has certainly received no such assurance. These would be important questions at any time, but they are emphasized particularly when we are seeking to obtain respect for our treaty rights in Berlin.

I ask unanimous consent, to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this issue from the Newark Evening News of August 19, entitled "Keeping Our Word."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING OUR WORD

For Americans, only one response is possible, Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles said of the Berlin situation. "We must adhere to our treaty rights, we must honor our commitments." This is a fundamental principle of decent men and decent governments.

To the people of Berlin Mr. Bowles' words must have sounded fine. But how do they sound to the Seneca Indian Tribe right here at home? Perhaps the words are not heard in the clatter of machines engaged in building a Federal dam that will flood the Senecas' land—despite a treaty that promised them undisturbed occupancy in perpetuity.

The Indians' protest is being ignored by this administration as it was by the last. Congress has surrendered to the Army Engineers, appropriating millions of dollars for the dam, which is to be a key structure in a project to control the floodwaters of the Allegheny River.

An alternate plan by Dr. Arthur Morgan, first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been ignored by the Government, although it offers a way to do the flood control job better and cheaper. Dr. Morgan's plan would use a vast natural swamp for water storage, instead of flooding the best lands of the Seneca Reservation as is now planned by the Army Engineers.

More important than the engineering aspects of the Allegheny is the moral question involved—the treaty of 1794 by which we were assured the friendship of the Senecas in exchange for an irrevocable grant of land.

What Mr. Bowles said about honoring our Berlin treaty applies with equal validity to the treaty of 1794.

Twenty Cents a Day To Live On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following:

TWENTY CENTS A DAY TO LIVE ON—AN APPEAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

In reporting to the American people your conversations with Khrushchev, you said:

"A small group of disciplined Communists could exploit discontent and misery in a country where the average income may be \$60 or \$70 a year and seize control, therefore, of an entire country without Communist troops ever crossing any international frontier."

Your remarks referred to nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America where millions of people live on 20 cents a day. Their governments are trying to preserve their freedom.

"The hope of freedom in these areas," you added, "which see so much poverty and illiteracy, so many families without homes rests with the local peoples and their governments. Yet all this does not mean that our Nation and the West and the free world can only sit by. On the contrary, we have an historic opportunity to help these countries build their societies until they are so strong and broadly based that only an outside invasion could topple them. And that threat, we know, can be stopped."

All this is true, Mr. President. Yet you have left unsaid something of utmost importance. In this struggle to preserve freedom, there is one factor which works to frustrate the purpose of our foreign aid programs, minimizes the heroic efforts being made by friendly governments and their citizens and which if unchecked will turn these people over to Communist enslavement. That unmentioned factor is the current population explosion.

POPULATION PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED

The phenomenon of the population explosion has been brought about largely by the success of modern medicine and sanitation in reducing infant mortality, prolonging life, and wiping out diseases such as malaria that previously kept population in balance. As a result, the human family is increasing at the unprecedented rate of 500 million persons in this decade, according to the United Nations. This crop of newcomers will exceed the total number of people now living in Russia, the United States, Great Britain, and France combined.

Ambassador Chagla of India, speaking in New York on "The World Population Crisis," said, "India's increase in population has been immense. In 1911, it was 250 million; in 1951, 356 million. As the census which was recently taken shows, our population has reached 438 million in the last decade. The rate of population growth in this decade has been 61 percent faster than the rate in the previous decade. . . . We have received from the United States foreign aid to the extent of \$3 billion since our independence. It was a generous gesture on the part of this country. It was also wise and statesmanlike because you realized the importance of economic advance in India in a democratic set-up. India was trying to demonstrate to the world that a poor, underdeveloped country can become prosperous without sacrificing freedom or democratic institutions. But the effect of this aid is, to a large extent, being nullified by the increase in population."

President Ayub Khan of Pakistan on his recent visit here did not mince words. "If our population continues to increase at the present rate," he said, "it will ultimately lead to a standard of living which will be little better than that of animals."

President Ayub's Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Said Hasan, added: "The most alarming feature of the census figures is the fact that the population of Pakistan has increased by 23 percent over the last decade. This is a much higher rate than we had anticipated. The rates of increase during previous decades had been much slower. If the trends revealed in the 1961 census continue, then the population of Pakistan, which doubled itself in 60 years between 1901-61, is likely to repeat the performance in half the time from 1951."

WHAT LEADING AMERICANS SAY

The population explosion has not passed altogether unnoticed in the West. Just a few weeks ago Eugene R. Black, president of the World Bank, reporting to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, said, "Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in the poorer countries. Unless population growth can be restrained, we may have to abandon for this generation our hopes of economic progress in the crowded lands of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East."

"The United States," said James Reston in a recent Washington dispatch to the New York Times, "is now embarking on a large new plan of economic aid to Latin America, but here again the whole policy is placed in jeopardy before it starts by the population problem."

It is estimated that the number of people in Latin America will rise from the present 200 million to nearly 600 million in the next 30-odd years. "Nothing is surer," Mr. Reston continued, "than that there will be a decisive revolt against foreign aid one day if the population problem is not faced. Probably never in history has so obvious and significant a fact been so widely evaded or minimized by the governments of men."

The clearest statement, perhaps, of the case was made recently by a top business leader, Marriner S. Eccles, formerly Chairman of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Federal Reserve System.

"The situation," he said, "has largely been brought about by our well-meant interference with the controlling laws of nature. From the most humanitarian motives we have drastically lowered the death rates in these countries, but have neglected to exert a compensating influence on the birth rates."

"Our policy has been to work for death control," Mr. Eccles added, "without taking the necessary steps to reduce the number of births, and so offset the consequent runaway inflation of people. A continuation of this present combination of low death rate with high birth rate is a sure prelude to disaster."

In the absence of realistic population planning, no conceivable economic aid programs will change this course. Inevitably, the existence of masses of people subsisting at starvation levels invites revolution and communism. Any foreign-aid program is, at best, a stopgap unless we deal with the basic cause—which is the runaway population. Unimpeded fertility is giving the underdeveloped countries exactly what they do not need—more people—and hindering what they do need—more capital, more skills and greater productivity."

REALISTIC U.S. POLICY URGENT

Mr. President, in your address to the American people on July 25 you said, "In these days and weeks I ask for your help and advice. I ask for your suggestions when you think we could do better." Responding to that request we, the undersigned citizens, urge you to develop a constructive population program to go along with the economic aid program. This was recommended you will recall in the 1959 Draper Committee report to President Eisenhower in which nine leading Americans called for assistance in population planning to friendly nations upon their request. By embarking on a crash program of research with the aim of meeting the population crisis our Government could make an enormous contribution to world peace and stability, and at the same time answer the increasing calls for help from friendly peoples overseas. We appeal to you, Mr. President, to consider promptly the Draper Committee recommendation. There is no time to lose when the tide of people is rising at a million persons a week, many of whom will not have enough to eat.

The present situation has been stressed in the recent hearings on the foreign aid bill in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Your own Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Wymberley Coerr, testifying on conditions in Latin America, said: "The direction of economic change is downward. The area as a whole is experiencing a population increase that is outpacing the increase in its gross national product and average per capita income. This trend is, in many cases, being accentuated by disinvestment and the flight of local capital caused by the fear of political instability and financial inflation. These developments further weaken the area's economic capacity. The long-range prospect, therefore, is that there will be more and more people to share less and less income."

Chairman FULBRIGHT, switching to the situation in Asia said: "The Indians and the Pakistanis have both very frankly said something has to be done about it. Their finance ministers came to see me and said something had to be done about this. This is fundamental to the success of the economic program. I do not see why the Government should be so reluctant about it."

In conclusion, Mr. President, we wish to repeat that we strongly favor your program for foreign economic aid. If, however, it is not accompanied by aid in population control it may well compound the problem. There will be more people living on 20 cents a day—more and ever greater appeals to Uncle Sam for economic aid.

Kennedy's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am not one who places great reliance on opinion polls as accurate

guides to public opinion. In view of the extent to which same polls are quoted as authoritative, however, I believe the following results of a poll taken by the San Francisco Chronicle are interesting:

RESULTS OF POLL ON KENNEDY'S RECORD

Following are the results of Chronicle poll No. 25, which appeared on June 21. They were compiled by the San Francisco office of Statistical Tabulating Corp.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. How would you rate President Kennedy's overall record after the first 6 months in office?		
a. Excellent.....	24	25
b. Fair.....	23	17
c. Disappointing.....	46	9
d. Better than expected.....	14	21
2. Has Mr. Kennedy made his foreign policies clear—		
a. To your satisfaction?.....	36	56
b. To the average American?.....	20	49
c. To our allies?.....	28	37
d. To Premier Khrushchev?.....	33	32
3. Before launching the Cuban invasion, do you think Mr. Kennedy should have—		
a. Committed sufficient U.S. forces to overthrow Castro?.....	36	27
b. Vetted the invasion before it got started?.....	54	16
c. Done just what he did?.....	12	39
4. Do you approve of the Peace Corps?.....	59	31
5. Are you satisfied that Mr. Kennedy is fulfilling his domestic campaign promises?.....	47	44
6. Do you favor the Kennedy bills for—		
a. Aid to education?.....	55	42
b. Medical care for the aged through social security?.....	61	34
c. Increased aid to Latin America?.....	70	21
7. Are you satisfied with the President's handling of—		
a. Recession and unemployment problems?.....	50	40
b. The defense program and the CIA?.....	33	54
c. Civil rights in the South?.....	40	48
8. In the November 1960 election did you vote for—		
a. Kennedy?.....	50	---
b. Nixon?.....	45	---
c. Another?.....	2	---
d. No one?.....	3	---

Address by Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Montgomery County, Md., August 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 14 I had the privilege of introducing the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, BARRY GOLDWATER, as the principal speaker at a meeting in Montgomery County, Md. The speech of Senator GOLDWATER follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, AUGUST 14, 1961

Congressman MATHIAS, Chairman KYLE, fellow Republicans and I suspect, as the chairman mentioned, a few Democrats. They have no other place to go today—and we certainly welcome them. I first want to apologize for having been late. I acted just a New Frontiersman on the way out. I didn't know where I was going.

This neighbor-to-neighbor campaign is one that produced results in 1960 and is one that will produce results in 1962. And let me start right at the outset by telling you people that 1964 is a long ways off. But 1962 is right around the corner. And I don't know if this country can stand 4 full years of the Kennedy treatment. And the only way that we can make sure that we can is to elect a Republican House of Representatives in 1962 which I am convinced we can do. Not only can we take the House, I think we can make rather sizable gains in the Senate—although taking control of that body would be somewhat of a dream right now. We have just too many southerners who are up for reelection and while we are making gains down there, we are not quite strong enough yet. But we do think in the Senate that we can retain the Republican Senators that we have up for reelection, some

15 of them, and we can pick up 7 or 8 Democratic seats, if we get to work, and I mean work hard. You've got JOHN BUTLER running for reelection in this State in 1962 and it is absolutely imperative that he be returned to office. JOHN is one of the most conscientious, hard-working Senators that I know in the whole body, and the thing that I like about him is that he thinks of himself as a U.S. Senator, not just as a Maryland Senator. As you know, there is such a thing as a United States, and in the Constitution we are pretty much charged with thinking of our Republic instead of being selfish in a narrow way and only thinking of our States. And whenever you hear of someone wanting to tamper with the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights or any of the basic concepts of our Republic, you'll find JOHN BUTLER out in the lead trying to defeat that. And you've got "Mac" MATHIAS here running again, in this district, in 1962. So don't be thinking about 1964. We can take care of 1964, if we win big in 1962. But if we don't make sizable gains in 1962, frankly I don't see much hope in 1964.

And don't think that the time isn't ripe. Why, if this election could be held tomorrow, there'd be no question about the outcome. Governor after Governor would be Republican. Statehouse after statehouse would be Republican. The House of Representatives would be Republican. I have traveled since the election in all 50—I'll take it back—49 States. I haven't been back to Alaska yet, and I find the kind of enthusiasm we need every place I go. It isn't just here in Maryland. It's everywhere. And every single speaker we have out, reporting back every Tuesday morning, is just flabbergasted by the amount of enthusiasm in this country for the Republican Party. It's better, frankly, than it was during the election. Don't ask me why, but it is. The people of America are more disturbed today than I have ever seen them in my political life. I think they have every reason to be disturbed. There is great evidence of this disturbed feeling.

We elected a Republican in South Carolina last week. Now, can you imagine that? The first time in history. We elected, about 2 months ago, our first Republican officeholder in the history of Georgia. And, of course, we elected a Republican in Texas,

which is really remarkable. Oh, they're trying to blame that on all kinds of things except the wonderful candidate we had and the fabulous organization Republicans put together. I think you ladies would be interested in knowing that they had ladies of all ages, all over Texas, and they called themselves "Tower's Tomatoes." They wore bright red skirts—they looked like tomatoes, real good tomatoes. They went around punching doorbells and working hard.

And, of course, down there the Vice President lives, and some Texans haven't forgotten that. They're a little upset. We don't like to be too harsh on the Vice President, though, because he did develop something new in this last election. You know he got the State legislature to allow him to run for two places on the ballot. In fact, he could have run for more than that—and don't laugh about it, because to us in politics it's sort of the Townsend plan. It's Federal aid to the aged politician. You see, if we extend this as far as we can, we can run for every position on the ballot. Now you can't lose them all. You've got to win one or two. I've always thought out in my State of Arizona that I'd like to be sheriff some day; but my legs are too straight.

But these indications that I've given you are not indications of something that just happened. These Republican victories in the Deep South are just the beginning. I might tell you, we expect to win two or three House seats in Texas and we expect to win two or three more seats in Florida. We feel we actually have a chance for a seat in the House of Representatives from Georgia. Now this is on the move. The trend has been developing for a long time. And people haven't paid attention to it. It's been occasioned by young people in the South—growing up realizing that they cannot live under a single-party system; that they have to have a two-party system; that there has to be competition between the parties all over this country in order that the best men and the best women can be sought to run for election and be elected to office.

Because that's all we're interested in—whether we be a Jeffersonian Democrat or a Republican—we're interested in good government. I have to make a definite differential between the word "Democrat" and Jeffersonian Democrat—because there's a great difference. There are many people today traveling under the name of Democrat, who aren't quite sure of its spelling, and have learned about the Democratic Party more from Walter Reuther and John Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, than they have from the teachings of Jefferson.

Now I want to try to impress upon you Republicans and you Democrats who are interested in good government, what happened in the 1960 election. Now, if we forget losing the Presidency—and I'll admit every day that gets harder to do, if we'll just forget that—we had, in my mind, the best election we've had since 1928 in the Republican Party. We picked up 307 members in State legislatures around America. We won two new governorships. We control eight more legislatures. We elected 21 new young Members to the House of Representatives. And we have advanced in local and county government. We elected a total of three new Members to the U.S. Senate—although one, unfortunately, died before he could be sworn in. So the move is on, and this is another move that hasn't just started. We took our whipping in 1958 and many of us saw this coming back as far as 1954, when we were beginning to lose sheriff races and races for State legislatures and gubernatorial races. Then came 1958 and the great debacle that year, and Republicans all over this country began to get to work. And as a result, in 1960 we had an outstanding success, as I say, if we forget the loss in that

very close election up on top, which, of course, we can't do anything about.

I heard a disturbing thing along this line coming out here tonight while I was trying to find this school: I heard that there was a rumor that somebody had broken into the county courthouse in Cook County and stolen next year's election.

We don't want that to happen. No, I think America has finally reached a point in its history where, once again, the people are going to make a decided and important change in its political orientation. Now, this isn't anything new in American government. We've gone through these cycles ever since we've been a Republic; ever since we've had a Constitution. We have been successful in government and our people have grown apathetic and lazy and have allowed people to get into government that did not have the best interests of our governmental way of life at heart. I recall 30-odd years ago, during my 1 year in college, the great swing against conservatism. For no reason at all we were resisting conservative professors and conservative businessmen and conservative politicians. We were doing it because we were young people and we were tired of being told what to do, and tired of being told that there was only one concept of government, one concept of economics.

And now, as I travel across America and see in audiences like I see here tonight, a great overwhelming preponderance of young people, I realize what's going on. The same thing in the opposite direction that took place in the late 1920's and early 1930's. The young people of today are asking themselves—why is it, after we have been through some 20 years of the best business in the history of our country—why are we spending four to five times as much on relief as we did when we first started it? Why is it that after having spent billions of dollars in an effort to alleviate what was called by Franklin Roosevelt "the suffering of the people," to relieve "one-third of the nation" (as he used to say, "who were poorly housed, underfed, poorly clothed"—do we still hear the President of the United States asking for more funds to help 17 million people "who go to bed hungry every night," and one-third of the people who are "poorly housed and poorly clothed"?

Young people are very naturally asking themselves, "Is this the way? Is the centralizing of all Government in Washington the answer to our problems, whether they be social problems, humanitarian problems, or the problems of the world?" And the young people are answering themselves by saying, "No"—more and more and more. Young people are looking to the Republican Party to bring to them the kind of government that they know this country deserves; that they know this country has to have if we are going to continue as a free people. The centralizing of government in the city of Washington is the most insidious, most dangerous thing that is happening to the American people today.

I don't rule out communism. I am not like the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who wouldn't know what to do with victory if we won it; who doesn't like the idea that we talk about communism as being a danger. I recognize it as a danger. But there is a far greater danger going on right here in America, and that danger is wrapped up in the idea that you and I as American people can no longer do for ourselves the things that we should. And that we should look instead to Washington; that the money we work hard for, the property we acquire, should be spent by an all-wise Government in Washington, which knows far better than we know about our local needs.

In fact, you are probably aware of the current argument that's been going on in

the Senate this week. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and others. This was started, I might say, by a memorandum that was sent by Senator FULBRIGHT to the Defense Department, suggesting that commanding officers not be allowed to discuss problems that they see arising in our country. Yes, they could discuss the enemy, they could discuss military matters, but to discuss dangerous trends in our Government is taboo any more. Well, I happen to be a part-time military man, but tonight I am not. Tonight I am a Senator. So that rule of McNamara doesn't apply to me.

The very interesting thing that has come out of this, that most of the newspaper writers have overlooked so far, has been this fact: nobody likes being associated with Communists, Socialists—with any other form of government, in fact, than our own. And yet, as Senator THURMOND has brought this message day after day to the American people—if we teach the true nature of communism we must recognize that it has a close alliance with socialism.

The people are beginning to think in a way that the—what I call the radical, not the liberal—the radical, has prayed they would never think in. More and more Americans are beginning to understand that all forms of government other than the governments of free men, require central control to become effective. This is a common and an absolutely necessary ingredient of government—collectivism. I don't care whether we call it communism, socialism, Fabianism, the welfare state, planned economy, the New Deal, Fair Deal, or the New Frontier. Contained in every one of these, is the absolute essential of government control. And people who have been advocating this, newspaper editors who have been editorializing for the welfare state, do not like to be reminded that they are talking about something that has the same first cousin as all of the other "isms" in the history of man, and that we have today.

Now, whether we call this the welfare state, communism, or something else, the responsibility for the welfare and prosperity and security of the people is presumed by these radicals to rest entirely with the central government. Now, let's take a look at that. If that were the way our Government should have been run, our Constitution would never have been written.

Our Constitution was written by men fresh from Europe and England, where bureaucracy ran rampant; where lives were controlled; where business was controlled; and they came to the shores of America, not to establish another Socialist order or bureaucratic order. They came here to discover what freedom actually is, and they did that. They built a government that would protect those freedoms. And these wise old men who lived here in Maryland and Virginia, Delaware, and in the Thirteen Original Colonies, these men to whom you and I owe so much, these men who said that they would risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, for this Government that they gave us, they discovered why we are free people. They discovered it when Tom Jefferson put down what I guess all of them knew, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If this isn't a good national goal today, and I read an awful lot from pretty smart people who say that we need new national goals—if the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness isn't a good national goal, today, then I suggest that we have to change our form of government. Because the entire Constitution was written to protect these rights, to enable us to use them, to protect these rights from the vagaries of men. And men, today, remain the problem of government, the problem of the world—just the same as men have always been the problem.

What we are doing today in government is flaunting the very concept of the American Republic. We are doing it by telling people, "Oh, you don't have to work. We'll take care of you. Don't worry about your father and mother when they get 65. We're going to have a Federal old-age home for them some place. We'll fix them up." And they're telling parents, "Don't be concerned about your children's education. Don't worry about the PTA, the school board, the county school superintendent, the State school superintendent. Oh, we have some very wise people in Washington who can run these institutions much better than you." In fact, you ought to read some interesting material. Get the book they put out on the education problem. It even goes further. We are going to be responsible for international education. Handling our States isn't enough.

This is the trend that we have taken, ladies and gentlemen: that Americans all over this country are reacting to. I don't buy the idea that the American people have succumbed to the low moral attitude that the Romans did when they thought government should and could provide everything for them. Oh, government might feed you, it might give you the material things of life; but it can't give you peace. It can't give you happiness. It can't give you freedom. You take away the dignity of man by making him subservient to some government, and you have destroyed freedom. You take away freedom, and what good is living? I am disturbed in this vein by some of the utterances of the New Frontiersmen, who go around the world preaching that we can have coexistence, peaceful coexistence, with a philosophy of government that for years has announced as its only goal in life the destruction of the world, and the rebuilding of it in their image. And yet, peaceful coexistence is talked—we hear it everywhere we go.

I don't think there is an American living who actually would like to crawl on his hands and knees to Moscow to avoid having one bomb dropped.

And there is absolutely no question in my mind that the American people stand behind President Kennedy's words of just a few days ago, when he told Mr. Khrushchev what we intended to do about Berlin. I don't think there's a doubt in any American's mind, that if the call comes, we are going to go. No American, Democrat or Republican, wants war. But no American should ever be afraid to fight for the things other Americans have fought and died for. But our people are disturbed. And I find as much of it centered in the failures of our foreign policy over the last 40 years as I do in the concern over the drift in our domestic policy. This is a real concern. The people are not very proud of the United States and its relationship with the problem they call Cuba. They are not very proud of the United States in its relationship with problems that we have created ourselves around the world by being too timid.

Americans, I believe, are tired of having foreign countries write our foreign policy. I think what Americans want, if you don't mind my own personal opinion gained from talking with literally hundreds of our people, is direction. They want to know what is our foreign policy. They suspect it's peace. I haven't heard anyone spell it out; I suspect it's peace. Is it honorable or dishonorable peace? They want honorable peace. And they want to be told how we are going to achieve this. What are we going to do in a psychological way and an economic way, in a political way, to win over communism? Now, mind you there's only one other alternative. And that's defeat. There's no halfway between this thing you call victory and defeat. Because if you try to live with an enemy that's out to destroy you, you're not going to be very

happy—because the requirements of that living are going to mean doing away with the things we Americans like. I don't think Americans are too impressed with the idea of that kind of life. They don't like the idea of our continuing to talk about disarmament when—what have we got to give up? I keep thinking of a little simile in this respect. Here's a man about 7-foot five, who weighs about 260—and he's as hard as that table—and I know that just one whack with his fist and I am all through. But I have a gun. And he knows it. One day he says to me, GOLDWATER, let's talk disarmament.

We have that gun. We have the Strategic Air Command. We've got the greatest air force and the greatest military power that the world has ever known. And our enemies just want us to give it up. It's as simple as that—and I don't think we ought to be talking about it at a time when we ought to be maintaining and building our strength instead of appearing like we would weaken and yield in cases here and there and elsewhere.

These things I speak of are not new. And this of course is the surprising thing. We should get everybody in the United States to read history. It would show, for example, that it was the temper of the American people in 1898 that sent us to free Cuba. McKinley resisted it; the Congress resisted it; but the people won. It's been that way in every battle we've gotten into, every battle, whether it's meant war or short of war or argument. The American people have made themselves felt and now in this day and age the people are remembering that the Constitution starts out by saying, "We, the people,"—and they're starting to do something about it.

And the young people are recognizing what we in my generation didn't recognize, that there is a grave responsibility to government, to good government, and that we Republicans present today the only fully sound argument for good government that can be presented by either political party.

And don't buy this idea that the Republican Party is split—that there's some Grand Canyon between a Republican like Goldwater and a Republican like Rockefeller. That's not true. There are many, many areas of agreement. I'd hate to put Proxmire and Harry Byrd together.

Let's not in 1962 and in 1961 get sold on this idea that there is a fundamental difference in this party that's tearing us apart. There is difference. We'll all admit that. But there's also great areas of agreement. And as you go out and sell this party and its candidates to the people in your community and in your congressional district, you're going to have to have the answers—for these questions that they are going to raise with you about the great differences in this party. We actually, if you could see the statistics, are surprisingly close together, even though in some instances we are surprisingly far apart. But we have to have some fun some way. I can't think of anything worse than going through a day without an argument.

So, ladies and gentleman, in closing, let me as a Republican of a State many, many miles from you congratulate you upon what you did and urge you to keep this up—to let this spread.

We've done something like this in my own State. In 1946 when we started the work as a Republican Party, the registration was 9½ to 1 against us. And today I think when they count all the noses it's going to be about 1½ to 1. Their lead is coming down. We're getting closer and closer. But it hasn't been the work of one or two or four or five people. It's been the dedicated work of lots of people, particularly young people, and particularly young women. I have often said at home, you

men write the checks, and go on about your gin rummy and golf, and give me your women. And we'll win the election. That's what we do.

Two Giveaways on Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

TWO GIVEAWAYS ON FEDERAL AID

(By C. L. Dancey)

Two things are a dead giveaway that the present approach to Federal aid to education doesn't stop with a simple system for a flow of U.S. dollars to aid local school systems—but goes on to extensive Federal controls of schools.

The first giveaway is in the outline of the Education Agency which the Federal aid law would bring to life in Washington. This would be a monumental bureaucracy with bureau stacked on bureau, division on division, and branch on branch. The blueprint calls for armies of experts and armies of propagandists covering every phase of education from State elementary schools and high schools to universities and even international education.

Such a setup is hardly designed to just economically handle a simple transfer of money to local authorities. It is first a hopeless labyrinth that the applicant for funds must find his way through in order to get a thin dime of aid, and secondly, a basic structure for Federal controls invading every single part of local educational activities.

The second dead giveaway is the attitude of the administration and the liberal leaders of the drive for Federal aid toward parochial schools. They are dead set against including them. They are scared to death of having them included.

Why?

Because Federal aid to subsidiary church activities is against their principles? Nonsense. The FHA is active today and has been for years in aiding church-financed subsidiary activities like homes for the aged, and other such activities. Federal aid goes now to parochial schools for transportation and school lunches.

If Federal aid to education was not going to interfere with teachers or curriculums or such local matters, including parochial schools, it would be no different than present Federal aid activities to various church activities.

But if Federal aid is intended to carry with it Federal controls, they don't dare include parochial schools because State control over church schools would be unthinkable and a clear violation of American principles.

Thus, if parochial schools were included in the aid program it would automatically be limited to just what they have pretended it is—and Federal controls would be effectively blocked forever. That's why the Federal aid people are scared to death of parochial schools.

And that's a dead giveaway as to what is really intended by Federal aid.

A prime example is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church of that city, who is receiving through a church subsidiary a million and a half dollars of U.S. aid for

a church activity—but resists tooth and toenail including parochial schools in the Federal aid program. POWELL wants the program. He supports the administration completely—but like the administration, he wants to bar parochial schools.

The program will add new burdens to the already burdened supporters of parochial schools, and eventually snuff them out as such aid has always tended to snuff out private and local support of any activity. When the parochials are dead—Uncle Sam will run the whole shooting match.

That is the real program planned for us under the name of Federal aid.

And the actual help in dollars planned is a minute percentage, nowhere near the cost burden that would fall on local school taxpayers in Peoria, for example, if our schools had to absorb the thousands of youngsters now educated in parochial schools at their own expense.

As many times as we have been through a similar ring-around-the-rosy you would think more people would recognize it when it comes around again.

Will Congress Measure Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 31, 1961, I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 720, which will help stimulate economic growth and activity and provide additional jobs by the revision of our outmoded depreciation policy.

Our antiquated depreciation system was conceived in the depths of the great depression and was based on the proposition that so long as a wheel will turn a machine will not be discarded. Under modern operating and technical conditions this assumption is fantastically unrealistic.

The Batesville, Ind., Herald-Tribune in a recent editorial entitled, "Will Congress Measure Up?" points out an immediacy about the problems created by existing depreciation policies. Because this editorial imbues an idea regarding the retardation of our economic progress, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CONGRESS MEASURE UP?

Four Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy—have expressed themselves as favoring liberalization of depreciation allowances for industry, but Congress refuses to act, thereby retarding our economic progress.

H. Eugene Dickhuth, an economic consultant, describes the results of a grossly inadequate depreciation tax allowance. It has made one-third of our industrial plant and equipment obsolete. It has retarded the adoption of the latest technological improvements. It has handicapped U.S. manufacturers in trying to compete with products from foreign countries which have far more liberal depreciation allowances. It has blocked the creation of job opportunities for America's new workers who are increasing by

1.3 million a year. All in all, present allowances fall short \$8 billion to \$10 billion a year of meeting the needs of industry to replace plant and equipment.

There is an immediacy about the problems created by existing depreciation policies that calls for action now, without delay.

Sales and Not Manufacturing Cause Prosperity To Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the series of discussions conducted by various Members of Congress regarding the employment picture in our country. It was my privilege several weeks ago to discuss what creates more jobs in our economy. At that time it was pointed out that the way to create more jobs for more people was to create more sales. A typical example of what one individual can do to create more jobs by creating more sales can be found in the story of Mr. Herbert P. Field, who operates a business in the Sarasota, Fla., area. Several years ago Mr. Field conceived an idea to develop a place which he terms "a resort that is fun for all the family." From a meager beginning, through ingenuity and hard work Mr. Field has created hundreds of jobs and at the same time has made thousands of families happy. Those who chose to visit his resort oftentimes came from thousands of miles away. On their journey they bought gasoline, food, paid for lodging; in fact, all along the way they were creating more jobs for more people because someone was selling them something. But behind all this was their final destination. So, actually, it was Mr. Field who created the additional sales as the family journeyed from northern Wisconsin to Florida.

The following editorial that appeared in the Knight newspapers on Sunday, August 27, 1961, explains much better than I could what it means to our economy to sell something.

The editorial, written by Mr. John S. Knight, is printed below:

SALES AND NOT MANUFACTURING CAUSE PROSPERITY TO BLOOM—CAPSULE COMMENT

How good is business?

One Washington letter, circulated privately to businessmen, says "look at business and see how speedily it's zooming ahead, keeping in mind that only a few months ago we were in a recession."

Another weekly interpretive Washington newsletter reports that "the recovery looks stronger than ever except for consumer buying."

The financial pages tell us that steel, aluminum, paper, appliances, automobiles, radio-TV, furniture, clothing and shoes are bouncing back at a great rate.

Heavy industries have shown no pronounced surge but the economists think Government and defense spending will provide the needed stimulant.

Our minority opinion is that business, while well ahead of recession lows, is neither "zooming ahead" nor "bouncing back." The corporate reports don't show it.

Savings accounts are touching new high levels but these large spendable funds are being used cautiously in the purchase of consumer durables.

Until consumer savings are released in a greater flood of consumer buying, business won't be so hot. The customers are cautious because they worry about Berlin, higher taxes and a variety of national and world ills.

And lazy, inept salesmanship doesn't help get things moving. How long has it been since a salesman really tried to sell you an automobile?

Store clerks, or "salesladies" as they prefer to be called, appear bored and disinterested.

There is no valid reason, other than lack of effort, why business shouldn't be as good as the experts say it is.

We suggest that manufacturing activity should not be mistaken for prosperity.

Someone has to move the merchandise.

I commend Mr. Field and all of the small businessmen in America and congratulate Mr. Knight on his astute observations.

There's a Bright Side, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, there is much in current newspapers which would tend to discourage and depress the American people. In addition to the inflammatory Berlin situation, the uncertainty in Brazil and at the Geneva nuclear test ban talks, the serious setbacks in Cuba and in Laos; we continue to be concerned with domestic economic problems. In spite of the fact that our fundamentally healthy economy has brought us out of the recession faster than expected and stronger than predicted, the cost of living continues to climb, unemployment has not been significantly reduced, and "distressed areas" continue to blight our countryside. A superficial survey of these situations obscures the dominant and essential truth that today the United States is the strongest Nation in the world—militarily because of its balanced defensive might and overall striking force; politically because our institutions have been built and are maintained by free citizens; and economically because of its sound foundation of a free market economy.

Mr. Speaker, this tendency to allow the dark side to blot out the bright side is not restricted to national or international problems. The "crapehangers" are at work locally, too. In the area of Pennsylvania that I am privileged to represent, there are several localities severely affected by unemployment and its accompanying community and family distress. In an August 26 editorial printed in the Lock Haven, Pa., Express, this situation is cogently and carefully

considered. I would suggest that my colleagues examine this editorial, and particularly pay heed to its words of universal application:

A community which lets the "crapehangers" in its midst set its tone and create its atmosphere, is taking the first step toward ruining its own morale.

I am pleased to offer the entire courageous editorial for the consideration of the House:

Into the life of every community, as in the lives of all individuals, comes bad luck and good.

There are differences in community attitudes as there are differences in personal attitudes toward the vicissitudes and the ups and downs which inevitably occur.

Some people take their knocks with grit and teach themselves some useful lessons for the future; others react as if any interruption of good fortune is a treacherous personal blow. These same differences of reaction can be detected in the behavior of a community which is, after all, only the sum total of the people who live in it.

A community which lets the crapehangers in its midst set its tone and create its atmosphere, is taking the first step toward ruining its own morale.

Crapehangers are always on hand. They are the ones who eagerly snap up every bit of bad news to make it seem bigger and worse than it is. They add up a few unfortunate developments, and multiply their effect into a much exaggerated prognostication of future collapse.

Some of the local crapehangers have been having a field day. They keep recounting recent economic misfortunes—the closing of the woven wire mill, the loss of the Sylvania plant, the threat against the General Armature & Manufacturing Co., unless its employees and the community can buy the firm, the reductions among executive personnel at the paper mill and the dye plant, occasional layoffs by the aircraft factory, and similar changes in lesser business enterprises.

All these things have occurred, of course. No one would deny that they have been discouraging and disappointing and, in the cases of the individuals affected, personally devastating. That personal aspect also lays its penalty on the community, for many of the people who leave town are among the intellectual and civic leaders, people who have accepted more than their share of the tasks of community initiative. Their loss is a real community hardship.

Yet, there is another side to the picture, a side which the crapehangers do not consider, in their eagerness to make things look as black as possible.

This is not a dead community—unless it decides to lie down and die as the crapehangers seem to want it to do. There is another alternative, to wake up and live.

For one thing, this community has been in much worse fixes in the past than it is in today. For another, the economic difficulties of today are cushioned, much more than those of the past, by the operations of the unemployment compensation system, financed by employers to meet just such conditions.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that this community is blessed by a diversification of industry. When things are slow in the paper business there is a demand for airplanes; when the electronics tube business slumps, there is an increase in the demand for instrument repairs; then the woven wire business goes down the drain, there is an expansion of the women's garment business.

A realistic view of our economic situation should see the good side as well as the bad, the prospects for improvement rather than the fear of more misfortunes.

Lock Haven has much to offer stable industries. The exhibition of courage and faith which is being given in connection with the campaign to purchase the General Armature Corp. is an antidote to the crapehanging tribe. The people who are joining in that enterprise are fixing their view on the future, and that is where the rest of us should be looking, too.

We are, if we but recognize the fact, on the threshold of great new possibilities, brought by the Keystone Shortway, which will be coming through in the next 5 years. This highway will solve one of our problems—that of accessibility.

Our economic history shows that this community first prospered because of the canal, which gave a great boost to the extractive industries and agriculture of this area. Then came the railroad, bringing in its wake new manufacturing industries. We are now in a new period of readjustment, as industry spreads into a nationwide and even an international pattern, which depends upon the entire modern system of transportation for its healthy growth.

In addition, this community has moved wholeheartedly into the new industrial development programs sponsored by the Commonwealth, with initial results, in the shape of the new Bobbie Brooks plant, for one example, which will continue to have a beneficial effect on the local economy day by day.

Because there has been a series of economic cutbacks, we should not overlook our real economic strength, our genuine opportunities, and the solid basis of our community structure.

Uninterrupted good luck is a phenomenon, not a normal condition. Normal life is a matter of meeting ups and downs. It is the manner of meeting them that makes the difference between a strong and sturdy community and a lax and dispirited one.

We should realize our strength and our possibilities, not spend our time counting over our recent disappointments. We want a healthy atmosphere for future improvements; we will not get it from the crapehangers.

First's Loss, Court's Gain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Detroit Free Press. I subscribe completely to the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

Our distinguished, able, and beloved colleague from Michigan will go down in history as one of the really great additions to the court. I can only say that it is a great loss to us in Congress to have the judiciary undercut the legislative branch of our Government by depriving us of some of our finest talent.

FIRST'S LOSS, COURT'S GAIN

Every 2 years now for a considerable while these columns have been advising First District voters that in Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ they had a Congressman who ought to be reelected.

Representative MACHROWICZ hasn't only loomed impressively in the Michigan delegation, which isn't notably difficult, but in

our view he had been one of the best seat holders on Capitol Hill.

Now he's going to be a Federal judge, taking the place of Judge Frank Picard, who retired from the bench last April.

It is an appointment both he and his constituents can be proud of, and congratulations are in order. If he does as well on the Federal bench as he has done in Congress (and we know of no reason why he should not) then the court will have acquired an added strength of considerable proportion.

Only, it's tough to lose the kind of a Congressman you can always speak well of, and who at election time can be endorsed with no soul searching.

Modern Day Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is confronted by great demands for Federal expenditures.

Because of such high costs and a huge public debt of over \$290 billion—the American taxpayer, and rightly, I believe, is deeply concerned with establishing realistic priorities for Federal expenditures. This includes also, according to my mail, keeping the Federal spending down to absolute essentials.

Unfortunately, however, there is among segments of citizens a somewhat distorted conception of the significance of public spending. Usually, it boils down to this: If it affects me and mine it is worthwhile and necessary. If, however, the programs support other segments of the economy this is very often termed "excessive spending."

Realistically, too, there is a widespread lack of recognition of how the majority of citizens benefit, one way or another, from such expenditures.

Recently, there has been circulating an article, perhaps somewhat exaggerated, but nevertheless at least partially true, about how many Americans often endorse ultraconservative principles of spending; meanwhile, they themselves, either presently or in the past, have in all probability benefited from a variety of publicly supported programs.

All Senators, I am confident, have received letters reflecting this philosophy. I ask unanimous consent to have an article caricaturizing the situation printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

The following description of a typical modern-day rugged individual is taken from the Mosinee Times.

It seems a young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army and upon discharge kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capital to supplement his GI checks.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an FHA loan and then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of a GI loan and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

Later, he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments helped pay off his debts. His parents lived comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity and the Government helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it, then the Government paid part of the cost of a pond and stocked it with fish. The Government also guaranteed him a sale for his farm products, if any.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked his money with a Government-insured agency. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free buses, played in public parks and swam in public pools. The man owned an automobile so he naturally favored the Federal-aid highway program.

He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new Federal building and a new post office. He even went to Washington with a group to ask Congress to build a great dam costing millions so that his area could get all the benefits it afforded.

Then one day he wrote to his Congressman: "I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own two feet without expecting Government handouts. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

Dedication of the Crawford County Memorial U.S. Army Reserve Center at Meadville, Pa., August 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the dedication of the Crawford County Memorial U.S. Army Reserve Center, Meadville, Pa., on Saturday, August 26, 1961, and to deliver the dedicatory address.

The memorial center was dedicated in memory of the members of the U.S. Army from Crawford County who made the supreme sacrifice. During the program, Mrs. John J. Healy, a Gold Star Mother whose son, Joseph Healy, was captured at Corregidor and died in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp, unveiled a memorial plaque honoring her heroic son and others from Crawford County for their patriotism and valor.

As master of ceremonies, Mr. Frank Hilton, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducted the interesting program during which time I delivered the following address:

PROGRAM

Musical selections, the Thunderbirds, drum and bugle corps, Mr. Edward Rudler, director.

Raising of national flag, honor guard, members of Battery A, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery, 502d District Headquarters (labor supervision), 4th Mobile Sales Section.

Invocation, Chaplain (Capt.) William E. Brown, pastor, St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Welcoming remarks and introduction of guests, Mr. Frank Hilton, master of ceremonies.

Presentation of center, Col. Robert H. Douglas, commander, XXI U.S. Army Corps.

Acceptance of center, Hon. George X. Simonetta, mayor, city of Meadville.

Hon. Herbert E. Mook, president judge, Crawford County.

Musical selection, the Thunderbirds, drum and bugle corps.

Remarks, civilian guests, military guests. Unveiling of memorial plaque, Mrs. John Joseph Healy, 425 N. Main Street Meadville, Pa.

Introduction of dedicatory speaker, Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS, Representative, 24th Congressional District.

Dedicatory address, Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Representative, 20th Congressional District.

Closing remarks, Mr. Frank Hilton, master of ceremonies.

Benediction, Rev. Father J. J. Cannon, pastor, St. Brigid's Roman Catholic Church.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE CRAWFORD COUNTY MEMORIAL U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER AT MEADVILLE, PA., SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1961

It is an honor to be invited to deliver the address incident to the dedication of the Crawford County Memorial—U.S. Army Reserve Center—in memory of the members of the U.S. Army from Crawford County who made the supreme sacrifice.

This occasion has added significance by the appearance on this program of Mrs. John Joseph Healy—A Gold Star Mother whose son, Joseph Healy, was captured at Corregidor and died in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp.

He was the first serviceman from this area to be reported missing in action in World War II.

Today we have witnessed Mrs. John Joseph Healy—with courageous heart and loving hands—unveil the memorial plaque honoring her heroic son for his patriotism and valor in making the supreme sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

The dedication of this U.S. Army Reserve center provides me with the opportunity to reflect on why we build such training centers; on why we spend our hard earned money for military things like guns, missiles, ships, and Reserve centers.

I would like to share my thinking with you on this vital matter—especially today when we face such a mortal test of our courage and strength over West Berlin.

We arm as a nation because our independence and our freedom have been challenged by the growth of international communism.

Indeed the independence and liberty of the whole free world have been threatened by this revolutionary force.

In this century it falls to the United States to act as the leader of freedom-loving people everywhere in the great task of meeting the Communist challenge and ultimately of establishing a world order among nations which is based on common consent and international law.

Our job is to work toward the development of an international community which is committed to the resolution of conflict by nonviolent means.

We have no illusions, however, on the difficulty we face in achieving this noble goal.

We are far from it.

Our experience since World War II has shown us that nations are all too willing to use force to gain their objectives.

They are unwilling to negotiate their differences.

Consequently freemen have had to arm to protect their liberties and the independence of their nations.

Contrary to our own wishes we have been forced to devote vast amounts of our economic wealth and the lives of our loved ones to the buildup of our military strength.

The President has asked us recently to make even greater sacrifices in this direction.

More—not less—military power is needed to meet the Communist challenge to free-world security and independence.

The Communist military threat has never been greater to our political and moral objectives.

It is instructive to examine this threat and to see where free-world interests are in danger across the world.

Militarily, we face three distinct dangers from the Communist bloc.

We must face and must eventually overcome the threat of general war and the possibility of nuclear attack.

Second, we must effectively counter conventional military threats of a less than total nature.

Third, we must learn effectively to deal with the work of saboteurs and subversive elements in many politically vulnerable nations across the world.

We must therefore have various kinds of military capabilities to meet these wide spectrums of Communist military threats.

Most important of all we must have a large ready general war force.

We cannot afford simply to have this force potentially ready as we did before World War II.

Soviet possession of large and growing stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs makes it imperative for us to have our strategic striking forces ready to go on a moment's notice.

We no longer can count on a period of years or weeks in which to mobilize our economic and industrial power for military purposes.

Soviet ICBM's now are only 30 minutes flying time from our major cities and the principal capitals of the free world.

Soviet bombers—while slower and more vulnerable than missiles—also offer a formidable threat to our national safety.

Premier Khrushchev has also announced the Soviet development of rocket-firing submarines.

Although we have no publicly available evidence to disprove his boast, we must avoid discounting it as mere propaganda.

Soviet experts agree that even if Russia does not now possess a missile-launching submarine similar to our Polaris, it has the scientific and technical know-how to produce such a weapon system in the next few years.

Soviet achievements in space permit us very little margin for complacency about its general war capability.

The Soviet Union's possession of strategic striking forces places an enormous political tool within its power.

Its initial effect is to blunt the political significance of our long-range nuclear attack forces.

We are no longer able to threaten Russia with nuclear destruction if it or its satellites should commit an act of open military aggression against some part of the free world without being threatened in turn with nuclear devastation at the hands of Soviet missiles and bombers.

Thus Khrushchev or his military leaders have threatened to send rockets against England and France during the Suez crisis in 1956; against the United States if it should intervene militarily in Cuba; and

against our military bases in foreign countries.

Although we are not afraid of such ultimatums it is important to recognize, nevertheless, that we must proceed more cautiously and prudently in using—or in threatening to use—our atomic might to support our foreign policy goals.

For the present the Communist and Western blocs live in a state which many have correctly termed a "balance of terror."

Both sides now possess nuclear knockout punches which are mutually destructive.

These are the military facts of life which we must understand and on which we must build a successful foreign policy.

Another significant consequence of Soviet nuclear strength is the effect it has tended to have on our allies and on uncommitted nations across the world.

Khrushchev on more than one occasion has threatened—with nuclear blackmail—nations which chose to cooperate with the United States against Communist military encroachments.

NATO countries have been warned that they will be subject to Communist nuclear attack in case of war.

Nations outside the North Atlantic Community have also been put on notice that they will be bombed if they permit U.S. military bases within their borders.

The vulnerability of these nations to Soviet threats—both in and out of NATO—coupled with the emergence and growth of Soviet capacity to strike the United States and its bases with nuclear weapons—has tended to undermine Allied confidence in America's willingness to employ massive retaliation in response to Soviet attacks against them.

Some have voiced the fear that we may not come to their aid in order to avoid atomic attack on our bases or on our shores.

Certainly these fears are groundless.

Nonetheless—the United States has taken a number of steps to allay the legitimate fears of our allies and to keep the Soviet nuclear threat in check.

The United States has placed paramount importance on continued maintenance of the existing balance of terror—while searching for military and technological breakthroughs which will tip that balance decisively in our favor.

The preservation—at the very least—of the existing nuclear weapons equation between the Communist and Western worlds is critically important if we are to avoid being blackmailed or, even worse, of being destroyed before we have had a chance to fight back.

Strengthening our general war capability reflects our determination to use nuclear weapons in behalf of free world interests.

It provides a convincing argument to the Soviet Union that it will risk tremendous damage if it attacks the United States or its allies.

We are spending billions of dollars to strengthen our strategic fighting force.

Both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations have actively pursued this goal.

Last March President Kennedy asked Congress to agree to a number of changes in our defense program in order to expand—and to make more invulnerable—our long-range nuclear forces.

The Polaris program was to be accelerated from 29 submarines by 1967 to the same number of submarines 3 years earlier.

Moreover additional funds were asked for practice firing missiles and for the development of longer-range and presumably more effective Polaris missiles.

Funds were also requested for the Air Force intercontinental missiles—the Titan and the Minuteman.

In addition, changes were made to advance our detection systems against ICBM attack.

More money was to be pumped into the Midas and Samos satellite programs.

Both will be tied to our early warning system to signal possible bomber and ballistic missile assaults or even to record suspicious troop movements and concentrations which might be a prelude to an attack.

The House of Representatives has not only agreed to these changes but has gone further and recommended funds for the continued production of B-52's which were scheduled for termination at the end of fiscal 1962.

To underscore further our determination to help our allies and defend our rights, the President has also taken a number of steps to increase our conventional forces to meet attacks of less than total proportions; to give, as he has recently said, a military capability which provides use with "a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear action."

To achieve this objective the President has decided to increase draft calls for the Army and to expand operating personnel for the Navy and Air Force.

In addition the President has asked Congress for additional authority to call up Army and Air Force reservists to active duty.

This new call to arms follows on the President's fiscal 1962 request for a strengthening of our nonnuclear fighting forces.

This Army Reserve Center which we are now dedicating is part and parcel of this conventional force buildup.

Larger conventional military forces help lay to rest the fear that we will use nuclear weapons on the slightest military provocation from the Communist bloc.

More importantly such a force makes it possible to counter a wider variety of Communist military actions.

We are able to meet force with equal force—while holding our atomic arsenal in reserve to backstop any military action we might be forced to take.

With a greater variety of military capabilities—we are in a better position to support the full range of our political objectives and commitments.

These run not only to the maintenance of our national independence but also to lesser—albeit important—goals of unhindered free world commercial activity and the protection of our citizens abroad.

For less important political purposes or against smaller military assaults than nuclear bombing—less military power will more adequately stop the Communists.

A policeman does not shoot every thief or hooligan he sees.

He first uses words to restrain the law-breaker.

If this course fails, He may take the man into custody.

Failure in this attempt may provoke him into using his billy stick and handcuffs.

If the outlaw still resists and attempts a physical attack, the policeman may be forced to threaten or to use his gun against his assailant.

Similarly the United States must always use words when they will be effective.

Failure at the level of diplomacy may necessitate military action of a gradually expanding nature.

At all times the military punishment we use must be proportionate to the crime committed against our legitimate interests and security.

Only in this way will we use military force wisely and justly in pursuit of our political and moral objectives.

Let us see how this reasoning applies to Europe.

Stronger conventional forces in the NATO army make it possible for supreme commander of NATO's military establishment—

General Norstad—to strengthen NATO's defense shield.

More troops as well as better trained and equipped troops will give General Norstad the military forces he needs to discharge three important functions:

(1) To protect all NATO territory against a major aggression by holding a Communist attack until our retaliatory power can be called into operation—(2) to deter limited border incidents or military probing actions by making it clear to the enemy that—to quote General Norstad—"He would have to use substantial force to breach the [NATO] shield—an act he knows would bring down upon him the full weight of . . . our heavy strategic power"; and (3) to permit greater choice in the kind of military force we will use against a Communist aggression.

We need not submit Europe or ourselves to a nuclear holocaust if we are prepared to use other more controllable and politically more feasible forms of our military power.

While we do not for a slightest instance give up our nuclear power—we do afford ourselves more room for military and political maneuvering which is in our best interests.

But Europe is not the only place where conventional forces will improve our military and political position.

Ready mobile troops will possibly have a more salutary effect in Asia and the Middle East.

Through successful conventional military action we stopped the Reds in Korea and demonstrated the West's will to fight.

Now we face military challenges in South Vietnam where jungle warfare is not easily fought with atomic weapons and mass armies.

We need different kinds of military power to win against Communist aggression in this area.

Conventional forces—part of which are trained to fight in guerrilla warfare—are more appropriate military means to achieve our political ends.

The landing of our Marines in Lebanon in 1958 is another pertinent example of the usefulness and pressing need for such forces.

Our quick dispatch of our Marines protected the Lebanese Government against subversion and possible military takeover by Communist forces.

President Kennedy's call for more Army and Marine Corps troops is principally designed to deal with future military crises in South Vietnam and in places like Lebanon throughout the world.

The Mexican National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of our southern neighbor, Mexico.

In 1960 the gross receipts of the Mexican national lottery were over \$55 million. The net income to the Government in that year was better than \$14 million.

Mexico, like the other nations of Latin America, realized the merits of lotteries long ago. There is not one Latin American nation that does not have a national or state lottery. In Latin America, the lottery is a time-tested and

proven financial device dating back several centuries.

It is time that we in the United States overcome outdated prejudices and biases to take the proper view of gambling and its relation to the Government. Gambling is ineradicable—the Government must act to control it rather than seek to ignore it—and a national lottery would make the gambling urge work for the public welfare.

First Catholic Slovak Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the First Catholic Slovak Union of U.S.A. and Canada, largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world, is holding its 34th triannual convention in Pittsburgh, Pa. An article on the history of the organization appeared in the August 1961 issue of the Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd official organ of the federation, of which the Very Reverend Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D. of Munhall, Pa., is editor. The article was written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist.

I extend sincere congratulations to this distinguished Slovak union for its great fraternal and humanitarian deeds in the past 71 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK UNION CONVENTIONS AND SLOVAKS OF GREATER PITTSBURGH, PA., AREA

(By John C. Sciranka)

The First Catholic Slovak Union of U.S.A. and Canada, will hold its 34th triannual national convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., August 27-31 at the Hilton Hotel. More than 500 delegates will take part in the deliberations of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world, which was founded on September 4, 1890 in Cleveland, Ohio, by the Reverend Stephen Furdek, known as "Father of American Slovaks."

Preceding the formal opening of the convention, Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh will offer on Sunday a pontifical mass at 11:30 a.m. in the St. Paul's Cathedral. Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., bishop of Gary, Ind., who is of Slovak descent will preach. Bishop Grutka's parents were married in Pittsburgh, at St. Elizabeth's Slovak Church on Pennsylvania Avenue, by the late Rev. Coleman Gasparik in 1901. Inasmuch as Bishop Grutka worked in the steel mill and his diocese is in the well known steel city of Gary, Ind., he is known as "steel workers' bishop." Other dignitaries present will include Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB, Cleveland, Ohio, and Rt. Rev. Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, OSB, Natrona, Pa.

While Pittsburghers and American Slovak fraternalists are reviewing the present status of the organization, which has a membership of over 101,000 and assets of some \$28 million, including a home for the aged and the

orphanage with a farm and printery in Middletown, Pa., a home office in Cleveland, Ohio, it is timely to recall that the union had previous conventions in Pittsburgh and its neighboring cities.

It is recalled that its second convention was held in May 1891 in the old Allegheny City, now North Side Pittsburgh, at St. Wenceslaus Parish, where it was decided to incorporate the organization. It is also recalled that John Bakos, and Martin Slanina, where the first Pittsburghers to attend original founders' convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on September 4, 1890. Bakos was elected first vice president and Martin Slanina, first auditor. It was at this north side Pittsburgh convention that the official organ "Jednota" appeared 70 years ago for the first time.

In 1895 the sixth convention of the union was held in Braddock, Pa., Rev. Raymond W. Wider, whose centennial birthday is observed was the organization's supreme president. The Reverend Richard Phelan, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh, greeted the delegates and was elected honorary president of the union. Father Wider was pastor of Braddock Parish (St. Michael's) and died on February 8, 1897, at New Haven, Pa.

In May 1898 the 8th national convention was held in Homestead, Pa. (St. Michael's Parish, Munhall) and in 1906 the 12th convention was held in McKeesport, Pa. This convention adopted important resolutions, especially to erect an orphanage in Middletown, Pa., and start a junior department, thus enrollment of the youth was launched.

Then in 1918 a national convention was held at Moose Temple, Pittsburgh, which the writer attended as a representative of youth and extended welcome and greetings.

In 1940 the convention was again held in Pittsburgh, with many new faces and the late Martin Slanina still active to greet the delegates.

Now during the 34th national conclave, it is recalled that the early Slovak pioneers in Pittsburgh and Greensburg diocese were first served by the Benedictine Fathers of St. Vincent's Archabbey, which was established on October 18, 1846, first as a monastery and on August 24, 1855, it was elevated by Pope Pius IX, to abbey. The late Reverend Anton Stromovich, OSB., S.T.D., professor at St. Vincent's and Msgr. Joseph A. Kushner, V.F., Donora, Pa., who devoted a great deal of time to the history of first Slovak and Slavonic pioneers of Pittsburgh area, find that since 1877 a Slavonic tongue was taught there and in 1884 first seminarians were admitted to study the Slovak language. Carl Koutek, Anton Panuch, and Charles Janda were ordained and worked later among the Slovaks.

According to Monsignor Kushner, Father Nepomucene Yaeger, OSB., born in Bohemia was ordained to priesthood at St. Vincent's Abbey, Latrobe, Pa., on July 14, 1875. He was the first Slavonic missionary to administer to the needs of the Slovak Catholics in the Pittsburgh diocese, although the venerable Bishop John Nepomuk Neumann of Philadelphia and well-known prince, Father Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin visited this territory before. Father Yaeger later became first abbot of St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Ill., where the Slovaks studied for priesthood in large numbers.

FIRST SLOVAK NEWSPAPER FOUNDED IN 1886

On October 21, 1886, first Slovak newspaper in America, the Amerikánsko Slovenské Noviny (The American Slovak Gazette) was founded in Pittsburgh by two Slovak teachers, Jan Slovensky and Julius Wolf, who first settled in McKeesport, Pa., in 1879. This is the 75th anniversary of this first Slovak publication in America.

FIRST SLOVAK SOCIETIES AND PARISHES

According to Monsignor Kushner the first parish in bituminous coal region was estab-

lished at Crabtree in 1890 by Father Fidells Busan, OSB. This was followed by St. Cecilia's Parish, Whitney, Pa., in 1891. Father John Martvon, noted Slovak fraternalist and first supreme chaplain of the union, came from Johnstown, Pa. to preach from time to time and administer sacraments. Later Father Adalbert Kazincy of Braddock, Pa., performed same services.

First all-Slovak parish in coke region was established in 1893 at Mount Pleasant, Pa. Father Coleman Gasparik was its first pastor. He then organized on March 31, 1895 the Parish of St. Elizabeth, Pittsburgh, where the writer was baptized on September 8, 1902.

On November 8, 1891, St. John the Evangelist Parish was established in New Haven (West Connellsville), Pa. Father Raymond Wider, well-known fraternalist was its pastor.

St. Wenceslaus, Bohemian parish in Allegheny City first served the Pittsburgh Slovaks. St. Michael's Society was organized on February 9, 1890, in Braddock and parish was established in February 1891. Father Raymond Wider was its first pastor. He was followed by Father John Polyakovich and in May 1896 by the well-known Father Adalbert Kazincy. Father Method Slatinsky also labored among the Slovaks during that period.

The Holy Trinity Parish, McKeesport, Pa., began to organize on December 26, 1892. Well-known Father John Stas visited it and recommended Father Emil Duchon as first pastor, who assumed his duties on December 28, 1894. The first Slovak societies were organized in the following cities and later joined the union: McKeesport, Pa., July 17, 1886; St. Michael's (north side, Pittsburgh, where the writer got his start as fraternalist and delegate), February 24, 1889; St. Michael's, Braddock, February 9, 1890, and St. John's, New Haven, Pa., December 27, 1891.

NOTED PITTSBURGH SLOVAK FRATERNALISTS

Martin Slanina and John Bakos, deserve prominent mention as first supreme officers of the union. Mrs. Ilona Ratkovich a Pittsburgher was first supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, elected in 1892. Andrew J. Pirhalla served as supreme president during the national convention in 1918. Michael J. Wargovich served the union for over 35 years in various offices and for 20 years as its supreme president. He died last January in McKeesport and was eulogized in the U.S. Senate by Senator HUGH SCOTT and in the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLIAM SCRANTON. Both published in the writer's biography of Wargovich in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Andrew Novak, supreme treasurer of the union for over 20 years also deserves an honorable mention and last but not least the late John J. Pekar-Baker, member of Pennsylvania Legislature and president of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an ardent fraternalist.

RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Vincentian Sisters of Charity of Perrysville, came to Pittsburgh (Braddock) in 1902. Sisters of St. Francis (Mt. Assisi Academy) in 1913. Slovak Franciscan Fathers, Avalon, in 1926. Their St. Anthony's Monastery at Uniontown, Pa., was established in recent years.

The highlight of the 34th convention will be the convention banquet on Tuesday, August 29 at the Hilton Hotel. Scheduled to speak are Bishop Wright, Bishop Grutka, and Gov. David L. Lawrence. On Sunday, August 27, there will be special initiation of members. Members of degree team include Joseph A. Demajan, district president; John Gaydos, Paul C. Kazimer, Frank Novotny, Joseph Feledick, Edward Myers, Herman Churilla, Andrew Stepanyak, Joseph Wargovich, Paul Giba, and Robert Kosko.

Monday, August 28, Bishop William G. Connare of Greensburg will offer a pontifical mass at St. Michael's Parish, Munhall, Pa. Msgr. Michal Shuba, Union's chaplain in Canada will preach in English and Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain in Slovak. Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., will give a welcome address. Masses will be offered daily for the living and deceased members. On August 30, mass will be said at St. Elizabeth's Church; August 30, at St. Gabriel's; August 31, at St. Joachim's and September 1, at St. Matthew's.

The following are the present supreme officers: protectors, Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojls, OSB., and Rt. Rev. Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, OSB.; chaplain, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew Biros; chaplain for Canada, Rt. Rev. Michael Shuba; president, John A. Sabol; executive vice president, Edward Minarcak; vice president for the eastern States, Stephen Onuska; vice president for Pennsylvania; Joseph C. Krajca, Jr., vice president for western States; Stephen J. Kandra; vice president for Canada, John Hurny; secretary, John Sabol; treasurer, Michael J. Zahorsky; chairman of auditors, Francis J. Semancik; auditors: Stephen Ungvasky, Jr., John F. Iskra, John A. Puhala, and John B. Hassay; general counselor, attorney Edward L. Kerpec; medical examiner, Dr. Rudolph E. Medlen; editor, Philip A. Hrobak; sports director, Cyril M. Ferencak, and president of supreme court, George Podrasky.

The writer had the privilege to be accepted as delegate to the Jednota convention in 1922 as a mere youth at an age of 19 and served as its assistant editor from 1922 to 1924, thus being the first American born Slovak to achieve this honor. Later on further honors were bestowed upon him by the organization, namely that he served as general chairman of two Jednota conventions in New York City. In 1928 the famous Gov. Al Smith and Mayor James Walker invited the convention to New York and Patrick Cardinal Hayes presided at solemn mass. In 1952 Mayor Impellitteri welcomed the supreme officers in the New York City Hall and proclaimed a Jednota Slovak Week. Cardinal Spellman opened the doors of famous St. Patrick's Cathedral and welcomed the delegates there. In view of these honors the writer is very happy that this privilege was extended to him to write this tribute in the Dobry Pastier, official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, which should be supported by all the true-loving American Slovak Catholics.

the county—was over the acreage allowed him under Federal crop restrictions. He destroyed the excess.

It is hard to face this situation without a stab of pain. People think pretty much alike and—if they brought themselves to think about this at all—they probably thought: Here we destroy growing food. In other countries, kids are hungry.

It is an emotional, impractical reaction, of course. But it's true.

Actually, how could the farmer, instead of cutting down this corn, have sent it to some starving fellow human somewhere? It would be impractical, if not impossible. Even for our Government—at least under present policies and approaches.

The Government does, of course, send food abroad in some small measure through our food-for-peace program. But for the most part it is not a matter of merely giving what you don't need to somebody who does. There are trade agreements. There are diplomatic barriers. Some governments frankly do not want our surplus grain, however much their individual citizens might like it, because it would gravely affect their economies.

Yet, the basic, inescapable fact remains: While we destroy food, some go hungry.

It is small wonder that many peoples of the world do not like us. Imagine what response last week's cornfield picture would evoke in a have-not nation of the world. These people heed not the practicalities of international life, but only their bellies.

It is there. It is a problem. It is not easily solved.

We can guess what hungry people think of this. But can we calculate the immense psychological effect this has on ourselves? It is there, whether we want to face it or not.

It is one thing to store our surplus. Always there is the hope that someday, some way, we can use it for good. But destruction is another matter.

Imagine workers with an earthmoving machine half completed—and then told to take a sledge hammer and smash it to pieces.

Imagine a cabinetmaker with a handsome chest half finished—and forced to soak it with kerosene and set a match to it.

It is not just the farmer who feels the pain and frustration of this destruction. It is all of us, individually and as a nation.

For at least a generation we have grappled with this bitter, heart-sickening problem. And still it awaits solution—not just because there are hungry people in the world, not just because of what other peoples and nations think of us, but because we must do it for the health of our own souls.

general manager of radio station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., pointing out the dangers of the proposed tightening of program control and the difficulties it would impose upon the small radio station:

COMMENT OF LUTHER W. MARTIN, OWNER AND GENERAL MANAGER, SHOW-ME BROADCASTING CO., LICENSEE OF RADIO STATION KTTR, ROLLA, MO.

If it has been established beyond doubt and question, that the Federal Communications Commission has the constitutional right to guide, oversee, direct, or dictate, the programming content of a broadcasting station, then and only then, can the FCC honorably inquire into, and grant or withhold its administrative favors as the licensees fall into line or fall out of line with the FCC programming regimen.

The statutory reason for the existence of the FCC is not to indulge in program censorship and/or control, but to deal with technical problems involved in frequency allocations and the maintenance of signals having acceptable audio fidelity. Without the engineering oversight of the FCC, the broadcast band would be a veritable electronic anarchy, and the entire population of the United States would be the loser. In achieving and maintaining a tight rein over broadcast licensees, it is obviously desirable and necessary that the character, legal qualifications, and financial qualifications of the applicants and licensees be screened. Nevertheless, there is even a limit, in a democratic country, to the extent or degree that a Government administrative agency should delve, in ascertaining the financial qualification of licensees or applicants.

In programming content, it is our contention, that the FCC is almost totally "off base" in presuming to even analyze programming. We realize that in granting mutually exclusive facilities to two or more competing applicants, that some criteria or measure must be utilized in making a determination as to the better or best qualified applicant. However, in the event this determination is based in any part upon programming promises or the lack of them, the FCC by its very action, has stepped into the role, effectively, of program censor. We sincerely believe that in this respect, the FCC has overstepped its constitutional authority.

If I may quote: "Freedom is not a piece of pie that can be cut into segments of assorted sizes and thus distributed. Each gets his equal share. Some are so ill-mannered, so disrespectful of its rewards, as to lose it altogether. As this applies to the individual, so does it apply to the medium. It is not difficult to stop reading a particular newspaper—or to stop dialing to a given radio or television station. Either action expresses your dissatisfaction with the product, and a sufficient rebelling will eliminate the producer."

The broadcaster thrives on the attention of the public and dreads inattention more than any other single thing. This is the true check, and the democratic one, against insolence of management or policy, as a person's vote is a check against insolence of office. (Harold E. Fellows—from the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, July 1955.)

In the opening paragraph of this statement, we said: "If it has been established beyond doubt and question, that the FCC has the constitutional right to guide, oversee, direct, or dictate the programming content."

Now, we will confine the rest of our remarks to this subject as if such a premise has been and is definitely established.

It therefore being the duty of the Federal Communications Commission to direct and oversee the programming content of station

No Matter the Reason, Destroying Corn Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

NO MATTER THE REASON, DESTROYING CORN HURTS

When you looked at it, you thought of the dark, unhappy days of Henry Wallace, when young pigs were being slaughtered.

It was a picture in last week's paper—you probably saw it—of a cornfield near Chillicothe. Part of the green, prospering corn had been cut down. Why? Because the farmer—and there are others like him in

FCC Programming Regimen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission is proposing to become much more restrictive in its oversight of radio and television programming and has given broadcasters until September 7 to file statements of their views on tighter program control. The small broadcasters of the Nation are quite concerned about the proposals. In that respect, I submit for the information of the Members the statement of Luther Martin, owner and

licensees, then there must of necessity be some means of sampling, analyzing, and determining the nature and degree of various program types.

One of the shortcomings of the "Statement of Program Service" in the present FCC forms, is that it is inadequate in cataloging and labeling the content of variety type programming. One 60-minute program may range all the way from a diskjockey's brilliant or dull comments, to news items, obituaries, ball scores, Red Cross announcements, and even a somewhat educational statement issued by the county farm agent.

As a small station operator, I must urge that the FCC avoid the adoption of a form of reporting and logging that will substantially increase the work load of our already quite busy "combo men." By a combination man, the small station operator refers to an operator-announcer, who spins the records during his shift, makes out the program log, makes out the transmitter log, reads most of the commercials, or turns on the tape recorded announcements made by some other voice, who runs outside to check the thermometer and rain gauge, checks the teletype machine, answers the telephone if his is the Sunday or night shift, and who is still sufficiently alert to call the chief engineer if something doesn't sound right, or a meter fails to read normally. This is the kind of a small station operation that will be imposed upon most by any increase in logging detail. Yet we realize that some of this detail will be increased, if the FCC concludes that its province dwells within the realm of program analysis.

We trust that by this somewhat wordy statement, we have initiated those who read it, into a slight knowledge of some of the problems of a small station operator. In any event, we are unalterably opposed to even polite censorship in any form, and the attendant increase in reporting redtape that would be forced upon us.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay Endorses Peace Agency Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lucius D. Clay introduced an important statement into the record during hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs concerning H.R. 7936 on August 24, 1961. His statement ably underlines the need for legislation in this field at the earliest possible moment.

His statement was as follows:

My name is Lucius D. Clay, formerly general in the U.S. Army, now retired. Presently I am chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and my residence is 1040 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.

I have been advised that there is now proposed for passage by the House of Representatives H.R. 7936, a bill providing for the creation of an agency to be known as the U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

As I understand the purpose of this bill, it is to create an agency within the Government to deal with the manifold aspects of disarmament, arms control and the improved functioning of our methods of keeping the peace. It is my strong feeling that the most

serious challenge which this country and indeed mankind faces is the necessity of controlling, if not eliminating, the use of nuclear or thermonuclear weapons of mass destruction by the nations of the world. If we do not do so we and our children are, at best, faced with a life of constant fear and danger, destructive of not only our morale but of our traditional institutions and way of life. To remove this debilitating and constant threat is one of the great demands on statesmanship today.

The subject of disarmament and arms control is a complicated and very difficult one. It requires knowledge of technical and political skills of a very high order and it requires constant application and attention. The subject in my judgment is so vital that it is one with which the Congress of the United States should have close association. It is for this reason that I believe the Agency charged with conducting studies and making recommendations in this field should have a separate statutory authority, a budget of its own, confirmation of its high officials by the Senate and a yearly report to the Congress.

I recognize the need for the Agency and its Director to be subject to the Secretary of State in all matters connected with disarmament which relate to negotiations or communications with foreign governments and I believe the bill before the House makes specific provisions for this. I do not believe, however, that this highly important subject is one which should be dealt with in a bureau of a department of the Government subjecting it to all the layers of authority which that involves.

Though the foreign relations of the country are involved, so is defense policy. I would, therefore, recommend that this Agency should not become a part of the Defense Department even though close cooperation and consultation with the defense agencies of the Government is essential. It is important that the Director of the Agency should have access to the President for there are interests cutting across the agencies which may be involved that will require a decision of the President himself. It will take strong administrative skill and a high degree of ability on the part of the Director if this great need is to be effectively met. However, it is entirely clear in my mind that it cannot be met unless the Agency has a standing of its own and a stature enabling it to present its point of view independent of the special interests of other agencies.

I have read the provisions of H.R. 7936 and, although I cannot purport to comment on all of the details of this bill, it seems to me to be a sound bill and one which fills a gap in our present governmental structure. I would strongly urge the committee to recommend it to Congress so that favorable action can be taken during this session.

The New Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 8, Public Law 87-128—the Agricultural Act of 1961, was enacted.

The law, of course, offers no miracle-type solutions to the extremely complex problems in agriculture. Nevertheless, it is hoped that it will help to contribute, moderately at least, to working toward

a supply-demand balance of farm commodities. Generally it is hoped, too, that it will brighten the economic outlook.

The law, however, still must pass the test of application to our farm problems.

Recently, the Farm Journal published a thoughtful evaluation of the major aspects of the farm bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR NEW FARM BILL

We have an omnibus farm law after all and the major farm legislation for the year is now complete. In its final form it's not a bad law. It contains some things which were never at issue, for instance, an expanded farm credit setup, extension of Public Law 480 to implement the food for peace idea, continuation of the Great Plains program, and the National Wool Act, and a more vigorous program for rural community development.

It lacks the dangerous features which the superplanners in Washington tried to put over and which Farm Journal opposed. The rather incredible power grab which would have moved farm lawmaking in effect to the Secretary's office never really had a chance with Congress, which wasn't about to surrender its prerogatives of writing the law. It did reveal quite clearly what the goal of the planners was and probably still is—to take over management of American agriculture if possible.

The law provides for a compulsory cut of 10 percent in wheat acreage, plus a further voluntary cut of 30 percent. Small growers can retire up to 10 acres. The feed-grains law is continued for another year, with feed barley now included.

There is no doubt whatever about the need for cutting both wheat and feed grains. Neither is there any doubt, in Farm Journal's opinion at least, about the necessity of retiring more land in order to do it. We never disagreed with that aim.

We did think, and still do, there were better ways to do it. But something had to be done and something is better than nothing, so let's hope we get the desired results with what we've got.

While we're on the subject a few observations seem in order in the interest of perspective.

1. It's well to remember that the new approach is built on the same basic ideas as the old of recent years. It simply is to pay farmers to retire land.

In one case we called it a soil bank. Also we had reduced crop acreages, with individual allotments, tied to support prices. There were penalties for exceeding allotments, as now. It was possible to take out whole farms, which helped many a marginal farmer and aging farmer get out of farming if he wished. It was a good provision.

This year we're calling it land retirement. We have a different method for paying farmers and we've upped the rental payment as well as supports. We've dropped the whole farm provision and everybody in the business is offered an historic share of the reduced operation, thereby tending to freeze the present pattern rather than let crops tend to gravitate to those regions and those farms that can raise them best. We've tightened up on cross compliance.

These are the chief differences in advancing the same basic idea.

2. Under both programs the critics have made much to-do over "paying farmers for doing nothing." The charge is misleading, but it sticks in the minds of taxpayers.

Actually, of course, instead of paying farmers for doing nothing we're paying them for doing something—for not raising a crop they could sell, from land on which they have a heavy investment. We're paying for stabilizing the Nation's biggest and most important business (raising food). You can't expect a man to lay up part of a productive plant, part of his investment, for nothing. What we're doing is renting it from him, and we should expect to pay the rent. The alternative is to starve him out.

3. We haven't seen the last chapter on farm policy. What we have may be quite temporary. The present program is probably costing \$2 or more for every bushel of corn we didn't raise this year (a cost of \$800 million or more for reducing the corn crop perhaps 300 to 400 million bushels). When city taxpayers learn that, the ruckus kicked up by "Cadillac" Smith might someday seem like a gentle zephyr. You may as well expect to hear more like it.

Removing the Safeguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Removing the Safeguard," which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Herald-Express.

I am in agreement with the position of the Herald-Express against the granting of long-term borrowing authority for the foreign-aid program, and believe the editorial may be of interest to many Members of Congress:

REMOVING THE SAFEGUARD

President Kennedy asked authority from Congress to be allowed to borrow \$8.8 billion over the next 5 years to finance long-range development loans as a part of the foreign-aid bill.

But why for 5 years or even 4 years? There is no assurance that Mr. Kennedy even will be President then. Someone else might be elected; someone else will have hold of the purse strings.

The President's argument is that he wants the 5-year-term authority because it would enable the administration to undertake long-range projects on a businesslike basis without the danger of interference by Congress, which might decide not to advance the money.

But that is what we would not like to see, the abandonment by Congress of its power to carefully oversee, and to deny, the squandering of billions of dollars if it feels such expenditures are not in the people's interest.

It would be a complete surrender of Congress power to check extravagances. It would be a give-in to dictatorship at the top.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, proposed an amendment to the aid bill which would flatly prohibit any assistance to Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, Senator DODD declared: "Aid to the Communists, in whatever guise, strengthens their war machines, reinforces their reign of terror against their own people, helps them to hide their failures, lends them respectability, breaks the spirit of underground resistance, and weakens the

free world by diverting our resources from our own vital needs."

Our principal fear is that if the long-range bill should be passed there might be wrongful diversion of the taxpayers' billions, without the safeguard of congressional approval.

No matter how much the committees, or Congress, might oppose any of these loan proposals, they would have no power to stop the spend boys. Even when the spenders are dead wrong.

Although we know this is a period of emergency, there is no good reason for Congress to abandon its power to hold the Nation's purse strings.

Seven Months of Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 25, 1961:

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of \$1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of \$3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least \$5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a \$1.5 billion surplus you have a \$5.3 billion deficit the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is \$6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the \$3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of \$10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimates for 1961-62 revenues were too high and he cut them back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue estimate for the year is \$82.4 billion, some \$100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's \$3.9 billion deficit, \$2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the \$6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from \$80.9 billion to more than \$87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than \$800 million of that \$2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it

came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961-62 budget, only \$3.7 billion of the total \$6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of \$10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than \$4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, \$3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining \$6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government, and all the rest. That \$6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that \$6.2 billion is \$6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary "to take additional action this year" and that "certainly" next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump priming, and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to "the urgent needs of defense."

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a \$10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

The 100th Division's Call to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the 100th Division, an Infantry division, has been ordered to active duty effective September 25. It is the first full Reserve division called to active duty in the Berlin crisis.

The 100th Division is a Kentucky division, composed of the 100th, 397th, 398th, 399th, and 400th Regiments, all of which are ready for combat duty.

Nearly 3,000 men serving in its units and representing 44 communities of Kentucky will report for duty on September 26.

The 100th Division is commanded by Maj. Gen. Dillman Atkinson Rash. Brig. Gen. Benjamin J. Butler and Brig. Gen. Albert H. Nosun are assistant division commanders. They are all residents of Kentucky.

Thirty to forty percent of the men of the division are veterans of World War II or the Korean war, and all others have completed at least 6 months of active duty under the Reserve program, as well as their regular training program.

The 100th Division fought in Europe during World War II with heroism and distinction. It helped break the Sieg-

fried line, and captured the German stronghold of Bitche.

Acting military duty for the 100th Division carries with it hardships for its men and their families.

Yet its men are proud that their division has been designated as the first division to be called to active duty, because of their effective state of training and their high morale.

Kentucky is proud of the 100th Division. We know that its men will make their contribution to its history and glory, as did their predecessors in World War II and the Korean war, and that they will continue with honor the military traditions of Kentucky, which began with the Revolution.

General Rash expressed the sentiment of the division and the people of Kentucky when he said the 100th Division faces duty with "pride in knowing a job and being able to do it."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Monday, August 28, one of which specifies the units of the 100th Division and the Kentucky communities which they represent.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING SOLDIERS OF RECRUITS—100TH TO BE DOING A JOB THEY KNOW—TRAINING

(By Tom Reynolds)

Kentucky's 100th Division next month will go to Fort Polk, La., to do a job they know: making soldiers of draftees and enlistees.

For the 2,900 reservists of the reactivated division are mostly instructors, aside from the overhead, or housekeeping, personnel.

The only one of 13 training divisions called up in the Army, the 100th is a versatile teaching organization. It has companies of men to teach artillery firing, tank driving, and giving medical aid.

But, says Operations Chief Lt. Col. Ernest Woodward, II, 535 Primrose Way, the biggest job will be teaching basic. Three of the 100th's five regiments are basic-combat-training units. These are the 397th, and 398th, and 399th.

FOUR HUNDREDTH GIVES BRANCH TRAINING

These regiments will take induction-station recruits and teach drill, discipline, first aid, and rifle firing.

There is the 100th Regiment, a common specialist training unit that will make clerks, drivers, typists, or radio operators out of some of the finished basic trainees.

The 5th regiment, the 400th, an advanced individual-training unit, will give branch training: schooling men for the infantry, artillery, signal, or chemical troops.

THIRTY TO FORTY PERCENT ARE VETERANS

About 30 to 40 percent of enlisted men in the 100th Division are veterans of the Korean or Second World War, estimated Maj. Blaine Guthrie, Jr., division information officer. All others have completed 6 months of training on active duty under the Reserve program.

Some 90 percent of the officers are veterans of one of the two wars.

What chance of oversea duty for the Kentuckians?

"Unlikely," believes Woodward. The 100th has spend several years becoming a training organization, and there should be little reason for converting to a combat outfit, he said.

The 100th is due for an indicated 1 year of duty.

In the past the 100th has been an Infantry and an airborne division.

"Uninvited" for the Korean war, the 100th had played a prominent part in fighting in France during World War II.

The outfit traces its military genealogy to November 15, 1942, when a predecessor division was activated at Fort Jackson, S.C. After training and maneuvers the "Century Division" went to France in October 1944, in time to help break German defenses along the Maginot line.

Members of the 100th shattered 200 years of military history by capturing the stronghold town of Bitche. In the closing days of World War II, the infantry division took part in a pincer movement east of Stuttgart, taking 5,684 prisoners. The 100th stayed overseas 7 months in occupational duty before inactivation of the division in January 1946.

UNIT BECAME AIRBORNE

From 1946 to 1952 the unit was an airborne outfit, then was redesignated as infantry until 1955, when it became a replacement-training organization. Finally in April 1959, it was designated the 100th Division (training).

Through the years since World War II, men of the 100th have drilled and attended 2-week training camps.

When reactivation news came last week, the Kentucky citizen-soldiers had been back from Fort Knox summer camp less than 6 weeks.

Following is a breakdown of the division by company and hometown:

Louisville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Receiving Company; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 100th Regiment; Company A, 100th Regiment; Detachments 1 through 7, 100th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 399th Regiment.

Lexington—Testing Platoon, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Transportation Detachment, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 397th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 400th Regiment.

Lawrenceburg—Companies I and K, 100th Regiment.

LaGrange—Companies B and C, 100th Regiment.

Shelbyville—Companies D and E, 100th Regiment.

Richmond—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 397th Regiment; Company A, 397th Regiment.

Berea—Company B, 397th Regiment.

Irvine—Company D, 397th Regiment.

Corbin—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 397th Regiment; Companies E and F, 397th Regiment.

Somerset—Company G, 397th Regiment.

Manchester—Company H, 397th Regiment.

Pineville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion, 397th Regiment; Company I, 397th Regiment.

Neon—Company K, 397th Regiment.

Hyden—Company L, 397th Regiment.

Evarts—Company M, 397th Regiment.

Owensboro—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 398th Regiment; Company A and Company B, 398th Regiment.

Henderson—Company C, 398th Regiment.

Hardinsburg—Company D, 398th Regiment.

Madisonville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 398th Regiment; Companies E, F, and G, 398th Regiment.

Providence—Company H, 398th Regiment.

Mayfield—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion, 398th Regiment; Company I, 398th Regiment.

Paducah—Company K, 398th Regiment.

Clinton—Company L, 398th Regiment.

Murray—Company M, 398th Regiment.

Lebanon—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 399th Regiment;

Company A, 399th Regiment.

Danville—Company B, 399th Regiment.

Campbellsville—Company C, 399th Regiment.

Harrodsburg—Company D, 399th Regiment.

Bowling Green—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 399th Regiment;

Company E, F, and G, 399th Regiment.

Burkesville—Company H, 399th Regiment.

Hopkinsville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion; Companies I and K, 399th Regiment.

Central City—Company L, 399th Regiment.

Dawson Springs—Company M, 399th Regiment.

Winchester—Company A, 400th Regiment.

Paris—Company B, 400th Regiment.

Mount Sterling—Company C, 400th Regiment.

Nicholasville—Company D, 400th Regiment.

Cynthiana—Battery E, 400th Regiment.

Williamstown—Company G, 400th Regiment.

Georgetown—Company H, 400th Regiment.

Morehead—Company I, 400th Regiment.

Flemingsburg—Company K, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Com-

pany, 2d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Battery F (Field Artillery), 2d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Com-

pany, 3d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Com-

pany L (Medical), 3d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Company M (Military Police), 3d Bat-

talion, 400th Regiment.

Fort Thomas—100th Division Band.

Frankfort—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 100th Regiment;

Companies F, G, and H, 2d Battalion, 100th Regiment.

ONE HUNDREDTH'S CHIEF PROMISES A CRACKER-

JACK SHOW—KENTUCKY UNIT'S ENTHUSIA-

STIC COMMANDER HAS LONG MILITARY AND

BUSINESS RECORD

(By John Briney)

Pride—"pride in knowing a job and being

able to do it."

That was the first emotion felt by Maj.

Gen. Dillman Atkinson Rash when he

learned that Kentucky's 100th Division had

been ordered to active duty September 25.

He indicated yesterday that his pride was

shared by his top aides, Brig. Gen. Benjamin

J. Butler, and Brig. Gen. Albert H. Nosun.

"This job is one we've been training for,

and we're going to give them a crackerjack

show," Rash said.

The 100th—a training unit—is the only

full division ordered to active duty in the

Berlin crisis. This fact gives Rash—who

has a great enthusiasm for things military—

a deep and abiding satisfaction.

NEAR HIS OLD CAMP

Rash—a successful Louisville businessman

and civic leader—will take his unit to Fort

Polk, La. That's not far from Camp Shelby,

Miss., where Rash first saw active duty as a

young major in January 1941.

Getting away from his business chores

poses its problems. But Rash said he felt

his military obligation comes first.

His enthusiasm for military life perhaps

stems from his childhood days in Earlinton,

Ky., where he was born and where his father,

Frank D. Rash, was a member of the Ken-

tucky National Guard. The elder Rash was

later State selective service director.

MALE HIGH VALEDICTORIAN

Dillman Rash moved to Louisville in 1922 and was graduated from Male High School in 1926 as valedictorian.

But in talking to a reporter yesterday, Rash seemed a bit prouder of being a captain in the Male High ROTC than of his academic kudos.

He attended Princeton University, where he was also a cadet in the ROTC, and upon graduation in June 1930, was commissioned a Reserve second lieutenant of field artillery. Shortly thereafter, he was transferred to the Kentucky National Guard, in which he was active until called to duty in 1941.

He was graduated from the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and was an instructor there from 1941 to 1943.

SERVED IN EUROPE

During World War II, he served as acting G-1 (personnel) of the 38th Division and in the G-4 (supply) section for headquarters, European theater of operations, U.S. Army.

Rash landed in Normandy 20 days after D-day and has two battle stars on his theater ribbon, although he explained he was never actually in combat.

He was promoted to brigadier general in 1955 and appointed acting commander of the 100th Division on February 3, 1959. He was promoted to major general May 14, 1959, after being made division commander. His decorations include the Bronze Star and the French Medaille de Reconnaissance.

JOINED BROKERAGE HOUSE

His civilian career started in 1930 when he became a securities analyst in the brokerage firm of J. J. B. Hilliard & Son. He later became a partner.

He is now president of Louisville Title Insurance Co. and is a director of the following organizations:

The Louisville Title Co., the Commonwealth Life Insurance Co., Atlas Plaster & Supply Co., Kentuckiana Television, Inc., Booker-Price Co., First National Lincoln Bank, Kentucky Trust Co., Louisville YMCA, and Christian Church Widows and Orphans Home.

He is a member of the board of First Christian Church and is a member of the Louisville Country Club, the Pendennis Club, the Rotary Club, the Arts Club, the Reserve Officers Association, the American Legion, the English-speaking Union, and the Kentuckiana Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

He served as president of the Louisville Chamber of Commerce in 1958 and is also past president of the Louisville Fund.

Rash, 54, and twice a grandfather, believes strongly in physical fitness and speaks proudly of his 30-inch waist. He is 5 feet 9 inches tall and weighs a trim 139 pounds. He's a hard-driving tennis and squash player and also likes to run—he's a familiar sight to golfers at Seneca, trotting over the hilly course in the evenings.

Rash appears as proud of the paratrooper's wings that he won at Fort Benning, Ga., as he is of his major general's stars.

WIFE GOING ALONG

Rash jumped five times to qualify for his wings and "once later to show off" during a Reserve maneuver at Fort Campbell the next year.

Mrs. Rash will accompany her husband to Fort Polk. As she put it yesterday: "It will be a lot easier for us now than it was 20 years ago" when their three daughters were all youngsters and there were all sorts of problems about housing and schools.

While the Rashses are away, they'll leave their house at 545 Barberrry Lane for the use of one daughter, Mrs. W. Roberts Wood, and her husband, who live at 2706 Riedling Drive. The other daughters are Mrs. Ralph

Brown, a professor of history at Harvard University, and Miss Nancy B. Rash, a senior at Radcliffe College.

Of General Rash's military peregrinations, Mrs. Rash had this to say:

"I always stay with him until we get where I can't go."

ASSISTANTS' BACKGROUNDS

Brigadier General Butler, assistant division commander of the 100th, was born in Trimble County in 1917.

He was graduated from the University of Kentucky in 1941 and entered active military service as a second lieutenant that June.

His military career includes combat service with the 34th Division in north Africa and Italy. He rose to battalion commander and was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Croix de Guerre of France, and the Italian Cross of Military Valor.

Butler was separated from active service in June 1946 but has remained active in the Army Reserve.

NOSUN BORN IN AUSTRIA

Brigadier General Nosun, also an assistant division commander was born in 1903 in Rohatyn, Austria. He attended high school in Pittsburgh, Pa., and received his commission as second lieutenant at Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Nosun served as an enlisted man in the horse-drawn 107th Field Artillery Regiment in 1923. When called to active duty in September 1940, as artillery instructor for the Kentucky Military District he was a captain. During World War II he was a commander of a tank-destroyer battalion in the South Pacific.

He later was assigned as chief of the Philippine Army G-4 section and chief of the maintenance section for Armed Forces headquarters in the western Pacific. His decorations include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, and the World War II Victory Medal.

The Urgent Needs of Medical Schools of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from the associate dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Richard J. Cross, transmitting a brochure prepared by the Association of American Medical Schools which brilliantly summarizes the urgent needs of the medical schools of this country.

In his letter Dr. Cross said he was sending me the brochure:

Because of a feeling that the seriousness of the situation has not been fully appreciated even by those who are deeply concerned about the health of the Nation.

Dean Cross warned that:

Unless immediate steps are taken along the lines indicated, the supply of physicians will inevitably fall far short of the Nation's needs, and the consequences of this will be grave indeed.

If you would like documentation of any of the items mentioned, please let us know.

The whole subject has been extensively studied by both medical educators and impartial laymen, and I believe each proposal can be strongly supported.

Because of the importance and timeliness of this subject, I include it here for the information of my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 18, 1961.

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I enclose a brochure prepared by the Association of American Medical Colleges summarizing the urgent needs of the medical schools of this country. I send it to you because of a feeling that the seriousness of the situation has not been fully appreciated even by those, like yourself, who are deeply concerned about the health of the Nation. Unless immediate steps are taken along the lines indicated, the supply of physicians will inevitably fall far short of the Nation's needs, and the consequences of this will be grave indeed.

If you would like documentation of any of the items mentioned, please let us know. The whole subject has been extensively studied by both medical educators and impartial laymen, and I believe each proposal can be strongly supported.

Hoping that you will do what you can to ensure passage of these measures.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. CROSS, M.D.,
Associate Dean.

RESEARCH—SERVICE—EDUCATION
THE PROBLEM: DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Each physician currently serves 750 people. Unless something is done, 1,125 people will depend on this 1 physician by 1975.

THE NEED

More medical schools and facilities; 3,500 additional physicians must be graduating each year from medical schools by 1975.

More medical students; many students are now discouraged from studying medicine because of financial worries and the long years before monetary reward is realized.

More teaching personnel to educate more medical students; to educate more graduate students (vital for teaching and research); to teach dental, nursing, and paramedical personnel; to train interns, residents, and fellows in special fields of medicine.

Medical education in America has grown great by support from universities, foundations, corporations, States, and individuals. The population is increasing faster than support from these existing sources can be expanded. The need for more trained personnel is national and international.

The Federal Government must now play a more active role by providing support for students and the institutions that will (1) be sufficient to encourage prompt, adequate action; (2) encourage modernization and expansion of existing schools; (3) encourage development of new schools; (4) encourage continuing effectiveness in maintaining diversified sources of financial support; (5) recognize the essential unity of medical education and research; (6) recognize the indispensability of libraries, university hospitals and clinics to medical research and education.

WE MUST MOVE NOW

It takes 6 to 10 years to develop a medical school and 5 to 9 years after college to complete a medical education. If action is taken today, it will be 1967-70 before an accelerated program will begin to produce more medical personnel.

It costs a student approximately \$11,000 to go through medical school. To ease students' financial strain, the Federal Govern-

ment should establish nonrefundable predoctoral fellowships available all 4 years of medical school, no way limiting the choice of school, imposing no restriction on postgraduate training or choice of career.

The grants should be available in a lump sum to each medical school, amount determined by enrollment, and administered by each school according to its particular needs, with no restrictions on the use of funds from other sources.

The expanding enrollments, and increasing costs of universities already threaten the survival of many medical schools. For universities to plan new schools, it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide cost of educational grants to bear part of the financial burden.

Congress must help by passing legislation providing grants for modernization, expansions, or replacement as needed of the educational, research, and library facilities of existing schools of medicine; grants for the establishment, modernization, and expansion of teaching hospitals and clinics, granted upon application by the medical school or university; grants for the construction of new schools, including research facilities and teaching hospitals and clinics; grants to students as nonrefundable scholarships; grants to schools to cover part of the cost of education; grants to institutions for studying the feasibility of establishing new schools.

Proposed by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

It is to the unfinished business in health—which affects every person and home and community in this land—that we must now direct our best efforts.—JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America.

Water Pollution a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many arguments were advanced in this Chamber for this year's water pollution control bill before it was passed and before it became law. One of the themes we sounded again and again was that municipal officials needed the provisions of the bill to meet their local problems in such a way that they would make a definite contribution to a national campaign against pollution.

We said, in other words, that a national problem existed, even though it had to be fought on local battlefronts—rivers and streams that pass from one political jurisdiction to another.

Already we see signs indicating that the water pollution law makes a necessary and very important contribution to that national effort. An editorial in the August 26 issue of the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post is one such indication. It gives an excellent summary of the ways in which the new legislation can be put immediately to work. It specifically mentions opportunities for progress in New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Water Pollution a National Problem" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION A NATIONAL PROBLEM

A bill to expand and strengthen the control of water pollution throughout the country has become law and, with the problem a general one across the Nation, it appears that Federal intervention is quite proper.

The legislation gives the administration broad powers to crack down on industries and cities polluting lakes and streams from which the Nation draws its water supplies.

Along with expanding Federal police powers in pollution matters, the measure authorizes sharp increases in Federal grants to local communities to help them build sewage disposal plants.

It empowers the Federal Government to start court action to crack down on any city or industry polluting any of the Nation's 26,000 lakes and streams, whenever State authorities approve. Existing Federal authority is restricted to the 4,000 water bodies which cross State boundaries and may be exercised only if the pollution crosses State lines. This unrestricted Federal authority would remain intact under the new law.

The legislation also will raise to \$570 million the existing \$262 million ceiling on Federal funds Congress may grant to local communities over the next 6 years to help finance construction of sewage disposal plants.

Moreover, it will raise to \$600,000 the existing \$250,000 top limit on grants to individual communities. The administration proposed a top limit of \$800,000. It feels that bigger cities have been penalized under the \$250,000 ceiling. Local communities must provide at least \$7 for every \$3 received in Federal funds.

President Kennedy feels pollution of rivers and streams has reached alarming proportions. He notes that to meet all needs—domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. The President quite properly has asked stronger Federal powers to combat the problem.

True, President Eisenhower last year vetoed a similar bill. He held that pollution was a local problem for cities and States to solve. That may be partly right, but it must be admitted that the problem has been heightened because many States have been inactive in the field, and Federal intervention against water pollution has become a necessity. One State's effort, for example, can be defeated if across a river or upstream another State is doing nothing.

Pollution control grants are to be distributed under a formula that would give special assistance to low-income States. Since the pollution problem is most acute in the heavily industrialized urban areas, there could be discrimination which might impair the effectiveness of the program by diverting funds from areas which need them most.

However, if the Federal aid program is allotted properly, and abuses are guarded against, the legislation, which the President has signed into law, can become an excellent weapon for combating a growing problem.

Senator WILLIAMS, a strong proponent of the legislation, has released a list of New Jersey municipalities, drawn up for him by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which already have applications pending or being prepared for Federal funds to use in pollution control.

There are 15 of them, asking a total of \$1,913,385 in grants to build sewage treatment facilities. They include Mount Ephraim, asking a \$70,800 grant to help pay for a \$236,000 project; Beverly, seeking \$18,900 toward a \$63,000 project; and Somers Point, asking for \$195,000 on a project to cost

\$650,000. Wildwood and Wildwood Crest also have applications in preparation.

Under the authorization bill, New Jersey water pollution projects will be allotted \$14 million in grants during the next 6 years. The money can be put to good use, as Senator WILLIAMS notes in referring to the recent serious outbreak of hepatitis which apparently was traced to the eating of raw clams harvested from Raritan Bay.

Reports on a Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper account from Assemblyman Norbert Nuttelman, of West Salem, Wis., and a letter from R. L. Schwartz, of Baraboo, Wis., giving their account of a recent trip they took to Europe and the Soviet Union. The trip consisted of a delegation of 36 Wisconsin agricultural leaders. I feel the Members will be very interested in this firsthand impression and the general views of these two men in regard to the countries and the people:

N. NUTTELMAN DESCRIBES TRIP INTO RUSSIA

Norbert Nuttelman, Barre Mills farmer and assemblyman from the second district, described his recent trip through Europe and Russia at the luncheon meeting of the West Salem Rotary Club Tuesday noon.

Nuttelman was one of 32 members of a Wisconsin agricultural good will tour which visited East Berlin 5 days before the Communists sealed off the border. He visited Poland and spent 8 days inside the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow has been prepared as the showplace of communism, Nuttelman said, it was not difficult to "see through the camouflage." The impressive Ukraine Hotel was mostly wasted space, with poor plumbing and no soap, but a reputation for bedbugs. Almost new buildings have metal screens over the sidewalks to protect pedestrians from falling masonry fragments.

The people live in crowded apartment houses owned by the Government. There are no private homes. The individual can be said to own the clothes on his back, but he pays dearly for them.

There were no children playing on the sidewalks or elsewhere. The guide said they were either in camps or in Government nurseries. Despite Government care of children, the birth rate is down.

Subways in Russia serve also as huge bomb shelters. Some are 125-foot underground. Airports are some distance from the cities, probably also for civil defense purposes.

At the state farms and collective farms, Nuttelman took exception to the glowing statistics given out by the farm managers. The scrubby dairy cattle with small udders couldn't produce the milk credited to them, he said. The type of hog raised was good, but poor sanitation and other factors made them slow to mature.

Equipment used on the farms was monstrous, without an impressive saving of manpower. All tractors had caterpillar treads. Collective farms out-produced state farms because sharecropping and private use of garden plots was practiced. Corn in the

Ukraine seemed the equal of that grown in this country.

Food served on Russia tables shows a complete lack of refrigeration in food preservation. Whole milk is not served.

Nuttelman felt that the Communists, who compose 4 percent of the population, have succeeded quite well in making human robots of the Russian people. They seem completely outside the Christian tradition as we know it and they worship Lenin and Stalin, whose tombs they visit on Red Square at the rate of 10,000 a day.

Nuttelman also visited in Hungary where hope of deliverance by America is still alive, and in Poland where Communism is resisted to the point of near starvation. He spent a night in the same German community from which his grandfather emigrated to America.

Western European countries are disturbed by our inability to do anything about Cuba. Nuttelman concluded. They see Cuba as a sign of our inability to meet the Communist menace, more so than we do in the United States.

SCHWARTZ FARM EQUIPMENT CO.,

Baraboo, Wis., August 23, 1961.

VERNON W. THOMSON,

Congress of United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just completed my agricultural good will people-to-people tour of Europe and Soviet Union.

It was most enjoyable and educational. I think our group did a great job in meeting the people and getting our message to them. Even in the Soviet Union the people were very friendly if you approached them in the right way, and were then very cooperative.

My idea on breaking down the Communist barrier is to in some way through the U.S. Government to invite 12 to 15 Russian people in the age class of 25 to 35 years to the United States for 15 to 20 days. Bring over a new group every month until we have brought over 100 people from different sections of the Soviet Union. Show them around—the way our people live and the advantages we have. They will carry the message back to their people and we would break down the Communist ideas faster than we can by going over there. We must start with the young people as the old people are set in their ways and cannot change.

I don't think Russia wants war anymore than we do. But let's not sell Russia short. They are doing a tremendous job in the agricultural field and they want to triple their production in the next 10 years. The people know this and with the standards the leaders are going to provide the people, they will, and are working for it.

Yours very truly,

R. L. SCHWARTZ.

Address of Hon. Lester B. Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently a distinguished visitor from Canada, the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, made a significant address at Boston University.

Mr. Pearson is a former president of the United Nations General Assembly, a Nobel prize winner and the leader of Canada's Liberal Party.

Because he speaks wisely on the importance and the vitality of Canadian-American friendship, it seems to me that his remarks deserve the wider audience of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR NORTHERN NEIGHBOR

(Commencement address at Boston University by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, P.C., M.P., M.A., LL.D., Sunday, June 4, 1961)

This is a time of the year when a large number of men and women, who, on leaving college to begin their new education, and even though they may have done nothing to deserve such treatment, are subjected to various forms of exhortation from older men chosen for that purpose. My own research agency informs me that, if all the preachments that have been aimed at graduating classes since the first commencement at the University of Stonehenge could be put end to end, they would reach that space which is just beyond outer space.

It was, I believe, a cynical French philosopher who said that: "Old men give good advice to console themselves for no longer being able to set a bad example."

I am not an old man, only an older one; old enough to realize, in fact, that, if I had any sense, I would not try to give you advice at all. Yet, if I didn't, how would I justify the honor that has been conferred on me by this great and respected institution, and which I appreciate more than I can say?

Perhaps it is enough to state on this occasion, now that you have B.A.'s and better, and are being launched into a new sphere of activity, that the world is your oyster. I hope that you will feel that it is worth trying to open. Do not take a cynical or defeatist attitude towards this operation, because there are still pearls inside worth going after; especially the priceless pearl of the good life; the good life which is concerned more with the dividends of inner satisfaction than with those from very common stocks, though I admit that there are occasions on which the latter are most helpful, and may even seem at times more alluring than less tangible, if more enduring, rewards.

I also hope, however, that you won't decide that the only way to open this oyster is to become an employee of Amalgamated Oyster Openers, Inc. Such an affiliation, no doubt, will give you the security and prestige of the "organization man" in the gray flannel suit. But the kind of security that depends too much on others, on the group, on the collective, may destroy something of freedom and self-reliance in your development as an individual, which is quite as important, if not more important, than security itself.

The Greeks—who had slaves to do the hard manual work for them—thought that the supreme end of the good life was the intelligent employment of leisure. We, who are being given more and more opportunity for leisure by mechanical slaves, will fall in that test of the good life if, among other things, we lose the satisfaction and enjoyment that comes from honest, hard, creative work; and if we lose respect for its dignity. By love of work, I am not thinking of Jerome K. Jerome's quip: "Work, I love it. It fascinates me. I could sit and watch it for hours and hours."

It is, however, idle to expect anyone to enjoy work if that work does not give some feeling of creative effort, of constructive participation, and of justice in the sharing of the wealth that results from it.

It is not going to be easy—it never has been easy—to achieve the good life, either nationally or individually. That merely makes the challenge more demanding and worth while. There will be setbacks and failures, but no one deserves success who is too easily discouraged by failure.

There will be many opportunities in the days ahead for you to test the value of the kind of education you have acquired here. Those tests will be for you as persons. But you are more than persons. You are citizens of a great nation on whose leadership and power rests the fate of hundreds of millions of people outside your own borders. So your national response to the demands and sacrifices of leadership and power will also provide a test of the value of your own education; in the wisdom and understanding and maturity you will show in reaching the judgments which are your minimum share in the direction of national—and because of your country's position—world policy.

One aspect of the foreign policy of your country—and a more important one than you realize because it normally proceeds without fuss or excitement—is your relationship to Canada, my country, and your northern neighbor; a country which, incidentally, is placed squarely between you and the Soviet Union. This makes us a middle power in other than the usual and more comfortable meaning of the word.

You should know more than you do about Canada; its growing strength, its problems, its policies; and its feelings about living right alongside the most powerful country in the world. Those feelings are a mixture of appreciation and anxiety. We know that we have a good neighbor, as well as a very powerful one; a combination that is not universal. But this doesn't mean that we have no worries about our relationship. We have; and Americans should be aware of them; just as they are often acutely aware of the different kind of problem involved in their relations with their Latin American neighbors.

Awareness of our mutual problems is, in fact, essential to that understanding which is the foundation of good relations. Ignorance, however benevolent, is an unstable and unsatisfactory basis for good relations between even the friendliest countries. Neighborhood doesn't become good neighborliness by accident or neglect.

Of course, we Canadians will naturally have a far greater interest in you than you have in us. This is inevitable, because you are so much more important to us than we are to you. Your influence on every aspect of our life—economic, social, cultural, political—is great and all pervading. You have even converted Canadian rugby into American football—almost—and you have us looking at westerns which are occasionally adult. Our boundary is certainly undefended against whatever emanates from your mass media of communication; press, periodical, radio, television, movie. It is with us a case of "Escape you, never."

Your continental and enveloping embrace is friendly, even at times fervent. But it can also be overwhelming.

In the economic field, your investment in our future—and your market for our goods—have been essential for our spectacular growth in the years after World War II. We Canadians should appreciate that. But it has some aspects that also make us uneasy.

We are by far your biggest and most unbalanced customer. Last year 180 million Americans bought about \$3 billion worth of Canadian products, but our 18 millions bought \$3,700 million worth from you.

We are deeply in the red on U.S. account and have been saved from its consequences only by your investment of capital in Canada.

This salvation, however, has resulted in more and more of our industries and our resources falling under control of fine and enterprising men who are, unfortunately, not Canadians.

The latest figures show nearly half of all our manufacturing industries are controlled by residents of the United States, who had invested, as of December 31, 1959, nearly \$16 billion in our country.

This has been to their advantage and to ours. To keep it that way, American companies and businessmen should be careful to insure that their Canadian subsidiaries behave in every way as a Canadian company would; with maximum Canadian participation in management and ownership, and with business policies determined by Canadian, rather than American considerations.

Our desire, indeed our determination, to control our own development to the maximum possible extent, while keeping our country attractive to foreign investors, is a reflection of the nationalism that now pervades Canada. That nationalism, while strong, is not, I hope, and will not become, either petty or parochial. For it is clear, as never before, that nationalism is not enough; that independence must be subordinated to interdependence. No country has more reason to recognize the importance of such interdependence than Canada.

It is a source of great pride to Canadians—or it was before our economy temporarily slowed down and our spectacular growth was halted—to point to the exciting progress of our nation in recent years. But that satisfaction must be qualified by the knowledge that much of this development—as I have indicated—depends on our financial and trade relationships with our neighbor; on the success, indeed, of its general economic policies which may not be directly concerned with Canada at all. As it has been said, a shiver in Washington or a sneeze in Wall Street and Canada catches cold. Our own policies, in fact, are often directed to finding ways and means of security against or relief from economic ailments, caused by germs which we believe are picked up across the border. Sometimes this may be the case. At other times the germs are very domestic.

This interdependence between us, which is increasing because of the kind of world in which we live, means that the relations between our two countries are becoming more complex and difficult. Do not misunderstand me. Those relations remain close and friendly and, in many ways, are the model of what such things should be between a great and smaller power. Indeed, if Canadians tend to become too touchy and anxious about some aspects of them, they should try to realize what it would be like to be Hungary, or Thailand, or Poland, alongside a Communist totalitarian empire. I assure you that we do appreciate the difference, even though we reserve the right—which is the happiest expression of that difference—to criticize from time to time what our neighbor on this continent is doing.

If we—and your other allies—seem to be too critical at times, just remember that your policies can do us great harm as well as much good; and it often seems that we can't do much about it, one way or the other. It makes for the kind of anxiety which comes from an inescapable dependence on someone else.

Indeed, our reaction to this dependence, which is not to be mistaken for subservience, is exactly the same as it would be with you if the situation were reversed. We are, you know, very much alike which, no doubt, is why so many hundreds of thousands of Canadians have migrated to Boston.

So you must become accustomed to the frank expression of our worries just as we

must learn to appreciate that you have far greater worries of your own which are on a world scale and arise out of the world responsibilities which, fortunately, you have assumed. It is on this basis of mutual understanding that good neighborhood can and must be maintained.

While, then, you must expect to receive criticism (and I hope that you will accept it with that stoicism that is the mark of confident maturity) I would not expect you to achieve the perfection of comprehension and charity illustrated by a story that Senator Barkley used to tell in Washington. It concerned a mongrel pup in his boyhood village whose good nature and patience the children used to try by invariably tying a tin can to his tail whenever they could catch him. The dog was both long suffering and adaptable and, eventually, had so conditioned himself to this kind of treatment that every time he saw a tin can, he obligingly backed into it. I am not asking the United States to back into anything—automatically—even to maintain good relations with Canada.

May I be a little more specific. Most Canadians, for instance, disapproved of what we thought to be a muddled intervention in Cuba. But most Canadians also appreciate the danger of a social and economic revolution in Cuba being exploited by international communism in Moscow so that this island, 90 miles off your coast, could become a base for a Communist offensive against Latin America.

This is a situation which may be repeated in other Latin American countries. It is made the more difficult because some of these countries are poor and underdeveloped, where the material for revolution is present and combustible; and where little help from Communist imperialism is required to bring about an explosion. The fact that communism is always at hand to fan, or rather to exploit, these winds of essential change, makes it all the more important, in dealing with them, not to be associated with the forces of reaction in any way which would indicate approval.

When we are associated in such a way, we merely give ammunition to our enemies; just as we do when act at home in ways which make our good words about fundamental human rights and the equality of all men sound pretty hollow.

I think, also important that, if and when action is required against forces of Communist subversion which directly threaten security and freedom on this hemisphere, that that action should not have to be taken by any one government, but collectively through the Organization of American States.

If you reply that Canada's advice on this matter would be more impressive if she herself would be willing to accept responsibility as a member of OAS; well, I agree with you.

But I can't refrain from adding that it wasn't many years ago that we were blackballed for membership in this hemisphere club by Washington—and others. I should also point out that if and when Canada does become a member, we will speak and act—as we have done at the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—in a way which will not mean automatic support for any country; even the United States. We are a friend and an ally; not a satellite. Nor would you want it to be different. Otherwise, our friendship and support would not mean much.

It is fair and accurate to say that Canada has not been hesitant to accept her own proper share of international and coalition responsibilities. Our record is a respectable one.

One of these responsibilities is to play a proper part in collective defense, which includes the defense of this continent.

The Canadian people are not neutralist or isolationist in this matter. There are some Canadians, I know, who would have us break away from our alliances, abandon our share in their obligations for collective defense, and discharge our international responsibilities solely through the United Nations. But they are a small minority, but a vocal one.

The great majority of Canadians realize that there is a real threat to freedom and security in the world today; that no nation on this crowded little planet can defend itself by its own resources, or deter aggression by national power alone; that we must be united to be strong.

So we Canadians do believe in collective security, collective defense, and collective international action.

We Canadians cannot be neutralist in any sense that would put the free, democratic people of the United States on the same level as the unfree imperialism of the U.S.S.R., in terms of Canadian relations, Canadian interests, Canadian friendship.

This would be wrong and inadmissible. Only in case of a breakdown of U.S. wisdom and steadiness in policy and leadership—and we do not believe that this will happen—would Canadians contemplate withdrawing from our existing obligations and commitments.

The effective discharge of this responsibility requires the closest cooperation in defense strategy and planning between our two countries, without regard to our boundary line. It also requires—but does not receive—the same kind of cooperation in defense production and in trade and economic matters generally. There is certainly a boundary in these matters.

While the great majority of Canadians agree on participation in collective defense, we disagree on how this can best be done. The party which I lead, for instance, believes that close cooperation in continental defense does not necessarily require continental integration in all defense matters. Our party also believes it would be a mistake for Canada to join the ranks of nuclear powers by manufacturing or accepting nuclear weapons for her forces.

We believe that the nuclear deterrent in U.S. hands is strategically and politically necessary in today's dangerous world, as long as the Soviet Union has nuclear weapons. But we oppose its dispersal among other powers that do not now possess nuclear weapons because this would make an accidental nuclear war much more likely and general and controlled disarmament much more difficult.

These differences of viewpoint within the two major Canadian parties, however, do not affect our common agreement that Canada should play her part—as she is now doing—in the Atlantic defense coalition; as well as in the United Nations.

I conclude by making a plea for the continuance of the closest and friendliest relations between our two nations; especially at this time when the free, democratic countries must stand together in the face of forces that threaten both freedom and democracy.

The other day I received a letter from an American lady in New York who had watched me on a television program in connection with President Kennedy's recent and highly successful visit to Ottawa, where he received such a tremendous welcome.

I must have said something about Canada's worries over U.S. pressures on her own national development—and this was her comment:

"I have visited your country on two occasions and the thing that disturbed me about the program was the fear of Canadians that they have lost some identity as a Na-

tion, that the Americans look upon them as practically being part of the United States.

"I am writing to say that I, for one, and all of the people I know, have never even considered Canada in this light. I feel proud to know that a nation such as yours borders on ours. I wish that there was a way of letting your people know how we feel here. Thank you."

That was a warm and generous comment.

In return, may I say—and particularly to you, who are leaving this university to take up your new responsibilities:

"I feel proud—and reassured as a Canadian—to know that people like you are on our southern borders as such good neighbors."

Du Pont Stockholders Should Be Taxed Only on Sale of Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Court decision involving the Du Pont Co. and General Motors poses some tax problems which Congress must settle. Without going into the merits of the decision, it would seem to me that two points are at issue, first, there should be ample time allowed for disposition of the stock so that both the present stockowners and the stock market will not be unduly affected; and, second, the proceeds from any sale of the stocks should be taxed only as capital gain.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal indicates some of the depth of the problem involved:

HALVING AN INEQUITY

There can't be very many Congressmen bemused by the thought that if they took a dollar bill out of their wallet and tore it in two they would thereby be the richer.

Yet here we have a whole assembly of furrowed-brow Congressmen wearying their brains trying to figure out how to tax stockholders of the Du Pont Co. for the profits reaped by tearing a Du Pont stock certificate in two.

For this is precisely what the Du Pont stockholders will do when, under Court order, the chemical company divests itself of its stock holdings in General Motors. A Du Pont stock certificate represents a share of ownership in all the assets of the chemical company, and at the moment a part of these assets are the shares of General Motors stock in the chemical company's portfolio. This has been the situation for many years, and of course the market value of the Du Pont stock is based on Du Pont's total assets, including the General Motors stock.

Now the idea, under the court order, is that Du Pont turn over directly to its stockholders their proportionate share of GM. In other words, the Du Pont stockholder will have two pieces of paper, one representing the GM portion and the other the balance of his shares in what's left of Du Pont's assets.

The Justice Department, the Treasury and the furrowed Congressmen have taken a look at this GM certificate and think, "What ho. This stockholder has a GM share he didn't have before. That's a gain. He must be taxed on this windfall."

Or to put the matter more accurately, they say this is what they think; because actually neither Attorney General Kennedy nor Secretary of the Treasury Dillon nor the majority of the Members of Congress are imbeciles. What makes them pretend to be thickheaded is the political fear that the populace won't understand and that they will be accused of letting the Du Pont stockholders get this wonderful windfall scot free of taxes.

This explains the spectacle now playing in Congress. There are a whole raft of schemes being gravely debated for a special law which will minimize the inequity of taxing the Du Pont stockholders for tearing their certificates in two. The Congressmen's conscience tells them they ought to relieve some of the inequity—but their political caution tells them they had better leave a little inequity. And that, if we may venture a prediction, is what they'll end up doing.

It's all ridiculous, but there's at least one solace for the Du Pont stockholders. As any Congressman can tell you, halving a dollar bill may not be a gain, but half of an inequity is better than a whole one.

The Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, much has been written and said about effectively combating communism. Presently, however, the Lutheran Witness, a magazine of the Lutheran Church, is publishing a series of four very excellent articles on the subject by the Reverend Lambert Brose.

In his first article entitled "The Communist Threat," Reverend Brose points out that when it comes to fighting communism, "We're not much interested in putting our money where our mouth is. This is appalling in view of the enormity of the Communist threat and the little time left before it may engulf us." Then Reverend Brose asks, "Why are we so apathetic?"

He goes on to answer this question. His answer is of such importance and timeliness that I now ask unanimous consent to have this first article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

(First in a series of articles by Lambert Brose)

Many Christians do not oppose communism. Not really. Not in all seriousness.

We make much noise about the evils of communism. But we keep pretty quiet when it comes to doing something about it. Like taking time off to study about this godless ideology and its frightening successes. Or making a personal sacrifice to combat it.

In the parlance of the street—when it comes to fighting communism, we're not much interested in "putting our money where our mouth is." This is appalling in view of the enormity of the Communist threat and the little time left before it may engulf us.

Why are we so apathetic?

ARE COMMUNISTS SMARTER?

The answer is simple. The Communists know they're in the middle of world war III. We don't.

As a result we've taken a licking from Khrushchev and Mao and their henchmen in many parts of the world.

Not militarily. We've stood up to them. Through NATO and the U.N. In Greece, in Korea, in Berlin. But we've taken a licking nevertheless.

The facts are indisputable. Some 40 years ago fewer than 2 million people were under Communist domination. Today that number has grown to more than a billion.

And in another 20 years, according to a projection by the Hugh Moore Fund of New York City, more than two-thirds of the world will be under Red rule if Communism continues at its present rate of growth.

WHY LAUGH AT KHRUSHCHEV?

Many people laughed in September 1959 when Khrushchev, visiting the United States, predicted, "Your grandchildren will grow up under communism."

However, that prophecy has already come true for 6½ million Americans living in our own backyard, for our friends, the Cubans.

Country after country has been drawn into the Red orbit: Mainland China (the biggest nation in the world), Tibet, North Vietnam, North Korea, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary. The list is a long one.

Judging by the cold statistics of the past—of countries won and lost—there seems little reason to laugh at Khrushchev's boast for the future.

(Obviously this statement does not imply any partisan criticism. The Communist victories took place during both Democratic and Republican administrations. But it's bitter medicine for us. Any man still refuse to admit these unpalatable facts of life.)

ATTITUDES MAY BE CHANGING

Perhaps, however, a new day is dawning. Perhaps the sensational events of the past few years—and weeks—are piercing the plush curtain of our complacency. At least some of the "experts" think so.

The new day began, they believe, in October 1957, when the Russians started breaking through the space barrier with a series of fantastic scientific firsts: the first sputnik, the first rocket to the moon, the first missile launched from an orbiting satellite toward Venus, the first man in orbit.

To top it all, polls taken last summer by our own Government's Information Agency, released this January, showed that the majority of people questioned in countries around the world thought that Russia—even before Gagarin orbited the earth—was ahead of us in this all-important conquest of outer space; all-important because of its world-wide psychological significance.

CHRISTIANS WHO ARE HELPING K.

And any American, any American Christian, who remains complacent in the face of these facts—and this is said advisedly—is aiding albeit, unwittingly, Khrushchev and Mao in their goal of enslaving the world.

There is comparatively little danger, it seems to me, of the majority of U.S. citizens being won for Marxism because they are awed by Communist achievements, or because they think that its ideology represents the wave of the future. For despite the Soviet's accomplishments in space, our country is still miles ahead of the Russians—and the Red Chinese—in almost any field one cares to mention.

But there is a real danger, because of our smugness, that communism could subvert and proceed to conquer step-by-step, according to Lenin's well-publicized timetable, Asia, Africa, Latin America, Southern Europe,

Northern Europe, and finally, fantastic though it may seem at the moment, the United States of America and Canada.

After all, the Bible assurance that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church of Christ does not preclude the downfall of temporal governments.

The first step in effectively combating communism is to make a realistic appraisal of it. This we shall attempt to do in a series of articles—an appraisal of its sensational growth; its techniques, its teachings, its goals; and what we Christians can do to halt it by a positive program that entails something more than mere anti-Communism.

A WISE MAN WARNS US

Recently Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former head of NATO, spoke to the annual conference of the U.S. Army Command Chaplains Conference in Washington, D.C.

Describing the inroads communism has made on a global scale, General Gruenther said some startling things about Communist techniques and their effectiveness.

One reason for Communist successes, said General Gruenther, is that this godless ideology—ironically—has convinced many people in the emerging nations that it really cares about their individual needs; that communism is a humanitarian way of life.

RUSSIA'S MEDICAL MISSIONARIES

Item: Russia alone, General Gruenther pointed out, graduates about 16,000 medical doctors each year. Many of them are sent to the uncommitted nations. There they live with the people—eating the same food as they do, suffering the same hardships. And all the while they treat the inhabitants medically, healing many of their diseases.

Our country? We don't even have enough doctors to treat our own citizens. Neither do the Russians. But they feel that winning the sympathy of the newly emerging nations is so important that they send many of their doctors abroad.

Some of the U.S. representatives, observed the general, seeing the conditions under which they were to live, quickly came back to the States.

The Russians, he went on, "had jolly well better not return to their homeland unless ordered to do so, if they know what's good for them."

Certainly there are Americans who are making heroic sacrifices in far reaches of the globe. Missionaries, doctors, teachers, Red Cross workers, International Volunteer Service representatives, and others. But the point is that the Communists send out their people each year in vast numbers.

FOREIGN SERVICE WORKERS

Item: In Russia today, General Gruenther pointed out—and this has been going on for years—large numbers of students from the Soviet Union and other Communist nations are studying in Moscow to become representatives in foreign countries. They take up to 4 years of university training, studying intensively the country to which they are to be sent: its languages, customs, religions—everything. Then they go to that country to live among the people.

In contrast, General Gruenther stated, most U.S. foreign service personnel live together with other Americans and West Europeans—often unable to speak the native languages—rarely mingling socially with the inhabitants of the country they're in.

Again, some U.S. foreign service workers are doing an outstanding job. The difference is in degree, the tremendous scale of the Soviet operation.

NEW WEAPON: 2-CENT BOOKS

On the other side of the world that second Communist colossus, Red China, is teaming up with the Soviets to overrun southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America like a metastatic cancer.

Realizing the truth of the old adage, "The pen is mightier than the sword," both Russia and Red China are flooding the uncommitted nations with books. Textbooks, comic books, fiction, nonfiction. Books which sell for as little as 2 cents each. Books so inexpensive that even the poor people can buy them; and in the uncommitted nations most people are poor. An instance is on record of even an anti-Communist teacher buying Communist books for his school because he couldn't afford others.

This weapon is tremendously effective. People in the newly emerging nations have an insatiable thirst for books. They'll read almost anything.

BIBLE HAS DROPPED TO SECOND PLACE

Eugene Burdick in an Associated Press story writes: "The Communist book distribution apparatus is so vast that it staggers the imagination. Some figures indicate that the Russians and the Red Chinese produce 3.6 billion books each year. This is more than one book for every person on earth."

Other sources state that the total book production of all Communist countries is now 5 billion annually, compared with the 800 million published in the United States.

As a result of this immense effort, Reporter Burdick notes, Lenin is now the most widely translated author in the world. The Bible has dropped to second place. In third place are the writings of Stalin.

LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD

Woven through each book distributed by the Soviets or Red Chinese, of course, is the Communist teaching, obviously or subtly. Mr. Burdick observes, for example, that in the story of Little Red Riding Hood—immensely popular among Asians—the wolf's face looks a little like that of Chiang Kai-shek. And the brave hunter who saves Red Riding Hood wears a small red star on his hat. The red star is known throughout Asia as the symbol of communism.

What is the United States of America doing in this field? Our U.S. Information Agency, on a limited budget, makes available for foreign consumption only a tiny fraction of the Communist output. The total USIA distribution for all foreign countries in 1960 was less than 5 million.

Moreover, in radio broadcasting to the uncommitted nations, the USIA admits that Red China has now gone into second place behind the Soviet Union. "In other words," writes the head of the Hearst newspapers, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., "we are now a poor third to Moscow and Peiping."

TWENTY TONS OF TNT PER PERSON

Until recent years Communist victories were gained by ruthless force. And in 1961 war is not ruled out; the present struggle in Laos is a case in point. In fact, brush-fire wars will undoubtedly continue endlessly.

However, both our country and the Soviets have now entered the age of the nuclear overkill. Each side has the nuclear power to destroy the other—and perhaps most of the world.

Some scientists estimate that the total nuclear power now stockpiled by the United States and Russia is the equivalent of 20 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth.

Consequently, neither side is willing to start a nuclear world war III deliberately, though each admits that a madman could trigger such a holocaust.

And our Government believes that the best preparation for peace is to remain so strong militarily—to fight big and little wars—that the Communists won't dare attack us.

ON THE WINNING SIDE

But in this world war III we're already engaged in—whether we realize it or not—the Communists have turned to other weapons. They have taken to heart, for their own ne-

farious purposes, St. Paul's words: "I have become all things to all men."

Recall for instance, some of the headlines that have appeared on the sports pages: "Russians Win Winter Olympics"; "Soviets Clinch Unofficial Summer Olympic Title"; "Bumel Outjumps Thomas in Garden."

Some people get angry when you call this to their attention. "So what," they explode, "can't we even engage in sports without bringing in politics?"

Sounds like a reasonable objection, like good commonsense.

The only trouble is that the Russians don't look at it that way. To them, every time they can beat the Western World—and particularly the United States—at something, at anything, it's one more weapon in their arsenal of psychological warfare to bring the uncommitted nations to their side, to what they proclaim as the winning side. Accordingly, their so-called amateur athletes are trained and nurtured by the state.

SPACE RACE AND MISSION WORK

Similarly, many U.S. citizens are outraged by the vast sums of money our country is spending to compete with Russia in the race to outer space. "We'd be a lot better off if we used these billions here in the United States, to heal the sick—to find a cure for cancer, heart disease, and mental depression," they say.

Again, this sounds like good commonsense.

But the Russians and the Red Chinese don't care about commonsense. Or, perhaps, they care about it more than we do—in a more profound way. Undoubtedly they're among the "children of this world" the Bible says we should be "as wise as".

We're told that every time the Russians score another first in space, their agents flood the uncommitted nations with a propaganda barrage. "Look," they say, "just 40 years ago we were one of the most backward nations in the Western World. Now we're first in the race into space. Why? Because of our communistic way of life. You, too, could make sensational progress if you adopted communism."

And anyone who thinks that this does not impress these relatively unsophisticated people, that it isn't important in the conduct of our Nation's foreign affairs and that it doesn't affect the foreign mission work of the Christian church—is simply not being realistic.

The Communists use everything—everything—in their fight to take over the world. And despite internal dissension and agricultural failures and all their other problems, so far they're winning.

This is true, no matter how much we try to explain their victories away.

Should Congressional Committee Hearings Be Televised?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of Congress recently prepared for publication in TV Guide a most illuminating commentary on the question "Should Congressional Committee Hearings Be Televised?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD this very convincing argument by our colleague, the gen-

tleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, in opposition to the televising of congressional committee hearings:

SHOULD CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE HEARINGS BE TELEVIEWED?

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee)

Hearings before congressional committees, like regular sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives, have traditionally been open to members of the public and to the press. This enables the people to keep posted on the activities of their Government, as befits citizens in a democracy. With the coming of television the question has arisen whether this powerful new mass medium should be given the run of congressional hearing rooms under the same terms, subject only to technical limitations, as are now accorded members of the working press. The Senate has no rule on the subject—each committee decides for itself, and Senate committee hearings are sometimes televised. On the House side, however, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has, wisely, I believe, refused to permit televising of committee hearings. The present statement was stimulated by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN's interesting article in the May 6 issue of TV Guide magazine, in which he advocates the use of television in this area.

Those who, like Senator MCCLELLAN, recommend that congressional hearings should be televised stress the growing interest of the American people in public affairs. To encourage and satisfy this interest, they argue, it is well to take the people fully into confidence by letting them see and hear, as well as read about, the legislative process.

Procedural fairness will be guaranteed, these protagonists of congressional TV contend, by the fact that possible dictatorial or arrogant behavior by Congressmen toward witnesses will show up and discredit those responsible. On the other hand, they urge, defiant, evasive, and untruthful witnesses will be deterred from excesses or be publicly exposed.

I am unable to share these optimistic estimates of the results of televising committee hearings. Indeed, I fear that we have much more to lose than to gain by turning these necessary fact-finding proceedings into television spectacles.

The heart of the matter is that television, for all its unquestioned wonders, is not well adapted for broadcasting the sober, fact-finding inquiries that committee hearings are supposed to be. Nor does the undoubted success of the medium in broadcasting ceremonies, addresses, press conferences, and debates afford a basis for contrary view. All such events are spectacles; they are intended to be spectacles. They edify as spectacles. What is more, whether the purpose be to dramatize our national traditions, to win or hold political support or to inform the audience on public issues, the participants in these spectacles exhibit themselves voluntarily.

By contrast, the purpose of committee hearings is neither to dramatize, nor to vie for political preferment, nor to entertain the public. It is to inform the members of the committees with respect to the virtues and shortcomings of pending measures and with respect to the need for legislation not yet introduced. Indeed, the sole justification for the exercise of the subpoena power of Congress, with its attendant sanction of punishment for contempt, is the search for truth. What is more, in the exercise of that power, congressional committees frequently summon to their hearings participants who do not appear voluntarily, who have not participated in the formulation of the ground rules and whose interest may even be to conceal or misstate the truth, rather than aid in its search. Whether subjecting such people to the glare of television cam-

eras is calculated to transform their reluctance into cooperativeness is open to serious question.

Insofar as congressional committee hearings partake of the nature of accusatory proceedings, witnesses are neither accorded the traditional safeguards of the criminal law such as the right to cross-examine, nor do they enjoy the privacy imposed upon grand jury proceedings. In consequence, if the chairman and committee members be unfair, witnesses face the risk of irreparable damage to their reputations under extremely unequal, not to say prejudicial, circumstances. What valid purpose can be served by subjecting them to the further ordeal of television lights and national network audiences?

There are other reasons why the medium is inappropriate for broadcasting such proceedings. I am breaching no confidence when I observe that Members of Congress are, in the nature of their elective office, extremely sensitive to publicity. The tendency of committee members to "get in the act" in the course of hearings is well known. This compulsive need to compete for the spotlight is immeasurably stimulated when hearings are broadcast live.

Congressional TV cannot be justified by the assertion that the television public has a right to see and hear, in its living rooms, what goes on at these hearings. Historically, the publicity of legal proceedings was and is a right of the litigants.

Nor has it been established that the interest of the people in receiving telecasts of committee hearings arises primarily from a desire to observe the Government at work. Judging from the type of broadcast the industry has presented, the general public is less interested in the serious, detailed consideration of problems than in the confessions of a Charles Van Doren, the humiliation of a Sherman Adams, the discomfiture of discredited corporate executives, the surliness of racketeers at bay, the number of times a witness takes the fifth amendment. It is the sensational, not the solid, on which coverage is focused.

Finally, it should be noted that although committee hearings are an important part of the legislative process, they are not the only or the most important part. It is the executive sessions of the committees in which the real give-and-take of the process predominantly takes place, and the debates on the floor of the House and Senate in which conflicting views and interests are finally resolved. Only the committee hearings, however, are proposed to be televised, for only they lend themselves to a publicity free-for-all for committee members.

I emphatically agree with the observation that Government business is not show business. The work of Congress requires sober reflection and quiet deliberation. It cannot operate at its best under the scrutiny of floodlights, invisible audiences and the confusion of light and sound equipment. We must not permit any practice, however popular, that tends to weaken the functioning of Government.

**Convention of Order of Sons of Italy—
Resolutions**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on August 18, 1961, the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention of the Order Sons of Italy in

America adopted a resolution embodying recommendations for amending the immigration laws. Let us not forget that both political parties included in their 1960 platforms promises to modernize these outdated laws. Thus far, however, no action has been forthcoming.

In an effort to again focus attention on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee of the Supreme Council, Order Sons of Italy in America, together with the resolution adopted by the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Resolution of Order Sons of Italy in America, 27th biennial supreme convention, Washington, D.C., Aug. 17-21, 1961)

Whereas the Order Sons of Italy in America has had a profound interest in the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, consistent with good Americanism, for over 57 years; and

Whereas the order has adopted a seven-point program to further its goal to bring about more equality, humaneness, and fairness in said laws; and

Whereas the order's seven-point program was in substance accepted by both the Republican and Democratic 1960 National Conventions; and

Whereas numerous bills and resolutions have been introduced in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives which collectively incorporate the order's seven-point program; and

Whereas the 1st session of the 87th Congress is near adjournment and during its existence no major hearing has been had nor legislation approved concerning this vital subject which has been crying for liberalization for many decades; and

Whereas this indifference by our Government has been allowed to go so far as to allow the humanitarian Alien Orphans' Act to go out of existence: Therefore be it

Resolved by the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention of the Order Sons of Italy in America, at Washington, D.C., on this 18th day of August, A.D. 1961, That we respectfully request the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to amend the provisions of existing law or adopt new legislation which shall include the following seven-point program:

1. Amendment of the national origins quota system and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.
2. To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.
3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.
4. To grant more favorable preference to relatives of the U.S. citizens.
5. To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.
6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens.
7. To revise and extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans' Act of 1957; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the President of the United States that prior to adjournment of this session of the 87th Congress he express his determination to seek immigration reform consistent with his pledges and past support; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United

States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the chairman of the Immigration Committees in the Congress of the United States, the majority and minority leaders in both Houses of Congress, the Director of the Immigration Bureau, and to each of the grand venerables throughout the United States.

REPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

Two years ago Brother Joseph A. L. Errigo, acting chairman of this committee, wrote a report for submission to the 26th biennial supreme convention, wherein he stated the following:

"We have reason to believe that the McCarran-Walter Act will be drastically amended soon—if not during the current session of Congress, certainly during the next."

This spirit of optimism at the time was justified. The presidential campaign had started and we could reasonably anticipate that candidates and political parties would broaden their scope and recognize fair and humanitarian immigration laws as beneficial to our country's progress and as an effective instrument in our foreign policy.

In this spirit H.R. 5896, providing for the entry of certain relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens into the country, and, H.R. 6118, which provides for the admission of aliens suffering from tuberculosis and extension of the 1957 act for the admission of alien orphans, were approved by Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower. The passage of these laws in the closing days of the first session of the 86th Congress, during the month of September in 1959, was in good measure due to the efforts of the supreme convention and the Immigration Committee in urging prominent Members of the Senate and the President to approve these bills.

The success we had with H.R. 5896 and H.R. 6118 raised our hopes that possibly Senate bill S. 925 introduced by Senator Keating, or Senate bill S. 1996 introduced by Senator Kennedy, and Senate bill S. 2358 introduced by Senator Humphrey and 11 others, would receive serious consideration during the 2d session of the 86th Congress in 1960.

However, the hopes we had soon faded away as the presidential candidates and political parties found it impractical to sway the chairmen of the Immigration Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the direction of reform of the McCarran-Walter Act. And so, no major immigration legislation was approved by the committees, and, hence, our elected Members of Congress were not given the opportunity to vote upon any of the bills calling for reform of our immigration laws. Congress did approve House Joint Resolution 397 which enables the United States to participate in the resettlement of refugee-escapees and provided for the adjustment of status of non-immigrants in the United States who desire to obtain permanent residence. The close of the 86th Congress brought with it the end of our hopes and we immediately set our sights on the promises of presidential candidates and the platforms of our two major political parties.

This committee, with the approval of the supreme venerable, anticipated the opportunity to publicize and project the order's immigration program before the platform committees of the Republican and Democratic political conventions during the summer of 1960. Brother Joseph A. L. Errigo, vice chairman of the committee, arranged for Sidney Clark, Esq., a delegate to the Democratic convention from Delaware, to

present our seven-point program. Your chairman obtained former Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, a delegate to the Republican convention, to prepare and submit a statement in support of the order's program before the platform committee. Brother George J. Spatuzza, ex supreme venerable and assistant secretary of the Republican convention, cooperated with Governor McKeldin in urging support of our program.

Your committee was gratified to read the immigration planks of both political parties, since both were substantially influenced by our program. Moreover, both candidates, namely, Vice President Nixon and Senator Kennedy, stated they would accept their respective platforms and implement the policies stated therein. The September issue of the OSIA News published on its front page the immigration planks of each party and urged the members of the order to study them carefully.

With the victory of Senator Kennedy, those interested in immigration legislation immediately found hope for profound changes in the McCarran-Walter Act. Your committee was aware of Senate bill 1996, introduced by Senator Kennedy on May 19, 1959, which would substantially liberalize immigration and eliminate the infamous national origin system. Furthermore, in correspondence with this committee on March 27, 1959, Senator Kennedy stated the following:

"It is my feeling that a major effort should be made to revise the national origins system of immigration. I do not underestimate the difficulties involved, but I believe some formula can be worked out that will be acceptable to all interested persons with the welfare of the United States at heart."

Again on April 21, 1959, in another letter to this committee, Senator Kennedy states:

"I am glad that my letter won approval of the persons attending the conference in Toronto. I hope that your pessimism over the possibilities of abolishing the national quota system is overcome by results. I have a draft of a bill and would be glad to discuss it with you and other members of your organization."

In a letter to this committee on September 1, 1959, Senator Kennedy in answer to the order's telegram requesting his support of Senate bills S. 925, S. 1996, and S. 2358, all of which called for broad liberalizing amendments of the immigration laws, he said:

"I want to assure you that I shall certainly continue to work for passage of these bills. As you know, I have long been interested in these problems and I am most anxious that action be taken on these bills."

In view of the above actions and statements of Senator Kennedy, this committee felt that now those interested in immigration reform would under the administration of President Kennedy have the opportunity to press their proposals before congressional committees with the strong backing of the President.

During the month of January, 1961, the Members of 87th Congress who normally sponsor immigration legislation were actively submitting bills in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Among the more prominent legislation in this field were bills by Representative SANTANGELO and Senator JAVITS. The bill of Representative SANTANGELO reportedly has the support of President Kennedy. However, the first sign that your committee had that the President would not actively seek immigration legislation, at least for this session, was that the President's state of the Union message delivered before a meeting of the Houses of Congress on January 30, 1961, did not contain any reference to the need of changes in the immigration laws. Moreover, we have noticed that there have been no changes in the policy and leadership of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Not only has there been no hearings on immigration legislation but the Alien Orphans Act of 1957 which the order favors in its program has been allowed to go out of existence on June 30, 1961. It is incredible that the entire leadership of our Congress and the President could not see fit to reenact this most humanitarian immigration bill. Presently, Senator KEATING, chief sponsor of a bill to extend the program for 2 years, with Senators NEUBERGER, BUSH, CASE, FONG, JAVITS, LONG, SCOTT, and WILEY is fighting very hard to gain passage of this bill by Congress. Recently over the strong objections of some Members of the Senate, Senator KEATING and his supporters managed to tack on the alien orphans bill as an amendment to a foreign educational exchange bill in order to gain approval of their bill. It is regrettable that tactics such as this must be used to move bills out of Congress. It could well be the only way to gain progress in the reform of immigration laws. We commend the Senators for their astuteness. Moreover, the committee recommends that a resolution be passed and mailed to the Members of the House of Representatives urging passage of this bill.

At the plenary meeting of the supreme council held during February 1961 at Miami, Fla., your committee submitted a detailed report at the request of the supreme venerable. Among other things, your committee recommended that our 7-point program be strengthened. After deliberation the supreme council adopted the following program unanimously:

1. Amendment of the national origins quota system and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.
2. To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.
3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.
4. To grant more favorable preferences to relatives of U.S. citizens.
5. To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.
6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to admission, exclusion and deportation of aliens.
7. To revise and extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans Act of 1957.

A resolution embodying the above seven-point program was adopted and forwarded to our congressional leaders and to the President of the United States. Through the OSIA News the grand lodges of the order were requested to obtain approval of the program in the form of resolutions adopted by the legislatures of their respective States and for all members of the order to write to their Congressmen urging the passage of legislation compatible with our program in the national interest. We are happy to report and we congratulate the Grand Lodge of West Virginia, under the leadership of Grand Venerable Angelo Viani, on being the first grand lodge to obtain the passage of a resolution by a State legislature urging the Congress to adopt immigration laws along the order of our program.

In closing, we recommend that the convention seriously consider broadening the scope, staff and funds of this Committee. The Committee knows of no more constructive purpose to justify the Order's contribution to the national and international interests of the United States than its enlightened historical interest in fair and humanitarian immigration laws. Congressional committees are looking for data on this subject and grassroots support. Unless the order is prepared to intelligently and effectively supply this need, there will be no real contribution in this field from the broad ma-

majority of the Americans of Italian descent. This will make it possible for those whose aims are not as broad to present themselves as spokesmen for us. The order must face up to its profound responsibility in this field. Until such time as this committee is brought up to full strength and support we shall continue to exercise our voices among our local Representatives and Senators in Congress to press for enactment of our seven-point program.

Members of committee:

JOSEPH A. L. ERRIGO,
Vice Chairman.
DELAWARE.
ANTHONY O. CALABRESE,
OHIO.
PAUL D'AGOSTINO,
MASSACHUSETTS.
ATTILIO RAETA,
CALIFORNIA.
ERNEST L. BIAGI,
PENNSYLVANIA.
SAMUEL A. CULOTTA,
Chairman, Immigration and Naturaliza-
tion Committee, Supreme Council
Order Sons of Italy in America.

Equal Rights for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week during the observance of the 41st anniversary of women's suffrage, the complete listing of Members of Congress who have introduced House joint resolutions on the equal rights for women amendment in the 87th Congress was not available to me.

Inasmuch as the discussion on the floor of the House should have given recognition to the 128 Members of the House who have introduced the resolution, I, under unanimous consent include the listing of these Members and States represented at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS ON EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AMENDMENT INTRODUCED IN THE 87TH CONGRESS

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York.
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan.
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, of California.
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York.
HON. JESSICA MCC. WEIS, of New York.
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER, of Tennessee.
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland.
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas.
HON. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia.
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania.
HON. JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona.
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland.
HON. EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky.
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, of Maryland.
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas.
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida.
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland.
HON. CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.
HON. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr., of Maryland.
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California.
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland.
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON, of Maryland.
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania.
HON. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan.
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts.
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana.
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California.
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania.
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr., of Alabama.
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California.
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL, of Connecticut.
HON. D. S. (JUDGE) SAUND, of California.
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California.
HON. HARLAN HAGEN, of California.
HON. MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, of Illinois.
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, of Florida.
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, of Illinois.
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania.
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., of California.
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California.
HON. JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania.
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas.
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON, of New York.
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania.
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX, of Michigan.
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.
HON. JULIA B. HANSEN, of Washington.
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE, of Pennsylvania.
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York.
HON. FRANK C. OSMEERS, Jr., of New Jersey.
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York.
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio.
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN, of Pennsylvania.
HON. CHARLES E. DIGGS, Jr., of Michigan.
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia.
HON. WILLIAM VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.
HON. PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska.
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY, of New York.
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington.
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Tennessee.
HON. JOHN DOWDY, of Texas.
HON. JOEL L. EVINS, of Tennessee.
HON. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania.
HON. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN, of New York.
HON. JACK WESTLAND, of Washington.
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts.
HON. H. R. GROSS, of Iowa.
HON. PAUL A. FINO, of New York.
HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania.
HON. JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma.
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire.
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York.
HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine.
HON. GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho.
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr., of Delaware (by request).
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, of Illinois.
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., of Connecticut.
HON. PETER A. GARLAND, of Maine.
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine.
HON. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr., of Florida.
HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL, of Arkansas.
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL, of New Jersey.
HON. MILTON W. GLENN, of New Jersey.
HON. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota.
HON. HERMAN TOLL, of Pennsylvania.
HON. PHILIP PHILBIN, of Massachusetts.
HON. JAMES A. BURKE, of Massachusetts.
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia.
HON. WM. W. SCRANTON, of Pennsylvania.
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio.
HON. B. F. SISK, of California.
HON. WALTER L. McVEY, of Kansas.
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut.
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana.
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas.
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana.
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana.
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri.
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa.
HON. JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida.
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana.

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois.
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER, of New Jersey.
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, Jr., of West Virginia.
HON. OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas.
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.
HON. DANIEL K. INOUE, of Hawaii.
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama.
HON. FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky.
HON. CHARLES DIGGS, of Michigan.
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.
HON. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma.
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI, of Illinois.
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, of South Carolina.
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, of New York.
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio.
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana.
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York.
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

Vice President Johnson Builds Job Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a splendid article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which has appeared in his syndicated column, and which is entitled "JOHNSON Builds Job Equality," relating to the work of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON in the field of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON BUILDS JOB EQUALITY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Without reaching for any headlines, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON is doing more to bring about the substance of racial justice on a very important front than those who talk most about it.

The Vice President has been busy at his work—and his work has been to remove discrimination against Negroes and other minority groups in the vast areas of industry doing billions of dollars of business with the Federal Government. In his role as chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, JOHNSON has signed commitments with nine of the Nation's largest defense contractors guaranteeing equal treatment of all workers and applicants in every aspect of labor-management relations.

These agreements cover approximately 1 million workers. The companies which have undertaken to cease all racial and other discrimination are Lockheed, Western Electric, Boeing Airplane Co., Douglas Aircraft, General Electric, the Martin Co., North American Aviation, Radio Corp. of America, and United Aircraft Corp.

These agreements represent company policy at the highest level and in each instance have been signed by Vice President JOHNSON and either the board chairman or the president of the firm.

This is the work of about 6 months—and only the beginning. Its largest significance is that it sets a pattern of employment practices, a standard and a code for all the rest of industry.

The JOHNSON committee is now negotiating similar agreements with other corpora-

tions and its objective is to extend them to the 50 biggest defense contractors by the end of this year. This would cover 11 to 12 million workers.

The success of the Johnson operation stems, in part, from the fact that it has not rested its initiative primarily on complaints of discrimination by individual workers or job applicants. It deals with these complaints, but its main concern has been to create equality of opportunity at the sources of employment. To this end the Vice President has had conferences not only with company executives but with the top union leaders.

Often the cause of discrimination against Negroes in employment is not with the company at all. There are many instances in which companies are ready and willing to employ Negroes but find that they are not available because they are not fitted for the jobs which are open because the unions have refused them apprentice training.

It is a revealing fact that there are more Negro carpenters in the South than in the North. The reason is that the unions in the South generally are not in a position to prevent apprentice training.

The first equal-opportunity agreement negotiated by the Johnson committee dissolved this kind of discrimination. The Lockheed plant in Marietta, Ga., had trouble employing Negroes for any kind of jobs except maintenance because the dominant local union discriminated against Negroes. One of the first effects of the agreement signed with Lockheed was to desegregate the local union. Now, without "freedom riders" or restaurant sit-ins, the restrooms, the lunchroom and other facilities of all Lockheed plants, including Marietta, are desegregated.

While some politicians are congratulating themselves that the Kennedy administration is doing nothing about new civil rights legislation, Vice President JOHNSON is doing more to further the substance of civil rights (equality in employment) without legislation than most people realize.

Secretary Ribicoff Wants To Feed Congress Federal Aid in Small Doses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune makes the interesting point of how the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare hopes to condition Congress into accepting the principles of Federal aid to education by getting the program passed a little at a time. The best way to avoid control of our schools by Federal bureaucrats is to resist any program which embodies Federal aid.

MR. RIBICOFF COMES CLEAN

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared before a sympathetic audience of National Education Association bureaucrats to tell why he offered a compromise version of the original \$6 million Kennedy package for Federal aid to education. The NEA is the principal lobby which has been agitating for Federal aid.

Mr. Ribicoff was moved to unusual candor in begging the understanding of the Federal

aid lobbyists. He said that his cutback bill provided the only possible basis "for any legislation this year." Acknowledging that NEA wanted Federal money for teachers' salaries, he said: "But the hard truth is that the House of Representatives is in no mood to approve Federal aid to teachers' salaries."

Then the Secretary got down to his strategic approach: "If all of the major controversies of this year are not resolved by the passage of this program at this session, I firmly believe that next year the controversies will be more bitter and the prospects for success will be worse. And I see little cause for optimism in the years after that if we fail to make this start now."

So it is now or never. Just as we said when Mr. Ribicoff first trotted out his substitute, the administration wants to get Congress to take a little dose of Federal aid now in order to force down a much bigger dose later. For the principle, if once given Congress assent, would lead to organized clamor for more of the same.

The LIFE Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the August 26 edition of the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal World carries a news story, an editorial, and a commentary on a novel program. Lawrence is the home of the University of Kansas. Last Thursday the Lawrence LIFE council was formed. This organization, the first of its kind in the country, is headed by an executive committee of seven local residents and has assumed the responsibility of locating housing for foreign students attending the University of Kansas this year and making these students feel welcome in Lawrence.

The editorial, the commentary, and the news story, are of such nationwide interest that I take this opportunity to bring them to the attention of my colleagues:

THE LIFE PROGRAM

Lawrence has responded in many ways to many worthy causes through the years. The fact the citizens have been so quick to recognize a good project and bring it to completion is one of the main reasons the town has grown and progressed as it has.

Now comes the Lawrence LIFE project. The initials stand for Lawrence International Friendship Enterprise. The purpose of the project is to get more Lawrence residents to become better acquainted with Kansas University foreign students and help them leave our country with greater insight, and perhaps greater appreciation, for our way of life.

The benefits will not be so readily discernible from this effort as they were from the KU HELP program, where money was raised to help with student loans at the university. But the potential of the LIFE effort is tremendous. Lawrence itself may never be able to trace direct benefits from LIFE. But there is a chance to help the country, and what is good for the country is generally good for Lawrence.

This is something of a Peace Corps plan

in reverse. We will have these foreign students in our midst, and will be able to show them firsthand how we live, what we think and believe and, perhaps, why. A great deal of good can be accomplished if the citizens will support LIFE the way they have backed other important civic efforts in the past.

A long-range view is necessary, because results may not be immediate.

Then there's another side to the picture.

The only sure way to peace is friendship and understanding among peoples of the world. As these visitors get to know us, so will we get to know them, and why they think, act and live as they do. Out of all this could come a great deal more mutual respect and admiration.

And it's with such stuff that lasting peace is achieved.

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

During the next 3 weeks, Lawrence citizens and those in the surrounding area will have the opportunity to be of service to their hometown, their State, the State university, and their country—as well as having a great opportunity to enrich their own lives.

Thursday the Lawrence LIFE Council was formed. This organization, the first of its kind in the country, is headed by an executive committee of seven local residents and has assumed the responsibility of locating housing for foreign students attending Kansas University this year and making these students feel welcome in Lawrence.

The "LIFE" stands for Lawrence International Friendship Enterprise, and represents an effort on the part of many Lawrence residents to do everything possible to show these students the true American way of life while they are in the United States.

This is a pilot project for the Nation. There are approximately 70,000 foreign students who will be attending classes in colleges and universities across the country this fall. If the Lawrence program is a success, chances are the local framework will be duplicated in cities elsewhere. The Lawrence LIFE program will be closely coordinated with the people-to-people program, which the Hallmark Foundation has assumed the responsibility of promoting. The success or failure of the Lawrence program will be followed closely by officials in Washington, Hallmark Foundation officials and those interested in international educational exchange programs.

Why is there a need for the Lawrence LIFE program?

Perhaps the best way to understand the need is for the reader to assume the role of a foreign student coming to the United States for the first time.

Suppose you were from Istanbul, Turkey; Baghdad, Iraq; Caracas, Venezuela; Bergen, Norway; Hong Kong; Taipei, Taiwan; or Cairo, Egypt, and were coming to Kansas University. You do not know anyone in Lawrence, there is no one to meet you when you arrive, and you know nothing about housing arrangements.

Perhaps university housing facilities are filled to capacity and there is no place to live on the campus. Alone, and without help, you try to find someplace to live. You don't have too much money, so you are not able to rent high-class accommodations. In order to have someone to talk to, you might end up living with a group of other foreign students.

As school progresses, you see little of Lawrence other than classrooms at Kansas University and your living quarters. You are not invited out to visit in any private homes, you are left alone on the campus during holidays such as Thanksgiving and Christmas and you feel completely deserted. Gradually the resentment builds. You had

expected so much from the time you first started planning your trip to America. By the time the school year is over, you have become bitter toward Americans—the people who had been pictured as having so much and being so friendly. When you return home, it will be difficult to say many nice things about your stay in the United States.

This situation actually exists. It has happened in Lawrence and in other college towns. However, it should be pointed out there are many, many cases with just the opposite result.

The difference rests on such little things as a simple "hello," an invitation to have a meal or meals in a private home, perhaps share a Thanksgiving turkey or help open packages under a Christmas tree.

Lawrence LIFE now is engaged in a crash program designed to encourage Lawrence residents to make rooms available to students who will be arriving on the Kansas University campus within the next 3 weeks. If there is not adequate room in the home to house a student, Lawrence LIFE would like to call on residents to "adopt" one or more students and make them feel there are close friends in Lawrence. A place where he or she will be invited to dinner from time to time and take part in other family activities can do a lot for international harmony.

A special housing service has been set up to go into operation Monday at the chamber of commerce office. Those manning the office will be able to give information about the program to anyone interested.

There might be some who say this is a one-way street, with no readily discernible benefits. It would seem the satisfaction of knowing you were doing something worth while for your country would be enough of a reward—but there is the extra dividend of getting to know these students and learning about other parts of the world.

Lawrence and its residents are in a unique position. They will be trying to launch a new, untested program. There isn't much time for thinking about the problem or wondering if you should play some kind of a role. Students will start arriving next week.

In a situation such as this, the Golden Rule should be a good yardstick.

RESPONSE IS GIVEN QUICKLY FOR FOREIGN STUDENT PLAN

Officers of the recently organized Lawrence LIFE program today reported many Lawrence residents have volunteered to offer housing and hospitality to foreign students attending Kansas University this year.

Monday an information sheet concerning the program will be circulated to all civic clubs and church organizations. Odd Williams, a member of the LIFE executive committee, said the sheet is designed to give many details about the program and tell of specific needs. Also, a LIFE housing service will open Monday at the chamber of commerce offices from 2 to 4:30 p.m.

The goal of Lawrence LIFE is to house as many new students as possible in private homes this year and to encourage local residents to extend hospitality.

Typical of the response, since LIFE was organized Wednesday noon, is the offer made by Tom Maupin, of Maupintours, in a letter to LIFE officials. It read:

"My partner, H. Nell Mecaskey, and I and our whole staff of Maupintours are vitally interested in the objectives of LIFE.

"In our business, we are in contact with people of other nations just about every day and in our travels abroad we meet foreign people and all of us here have come to realize the urgency of every American doing whatever he can to demonstrate sincere hospitality and friendship to foreigners, to gain their friendship and understanding, to help them understand America and Americans.

"I would like to volunteer our facilities for use by LIFE and to volunteer the time and interest of our staff. In fact, all of us here are enthusiastic about the aims of LIFE and each one of us want to help to make LIFE a highly successful organization.

"We have about 50 persons on our staff here in Lawrence and I know there will be 50 persons eager to welcome and provide hospitality to the foreign students attending Kansas University, and to do so throughout the year.

"Our office facilities, available free of charge to LIFE, include:

"1. A number of clerk-typists to do whatever letter writing, mailings, stencil cutting and running, and office work needed.

"2. Mimeograph and ditto machines to run whatever material needed.

"3. An Autotypist to run personally typed letters in quantity.

"4. A conference room where committee meetings can be held.

"5. A large front window for window displays.

"6. Telephones for use in telephone solicitation.

"We also have contracted for the inside back cover of Kansas University's football program which is distributed at all home Kansas University football games this season. This full page, first issue, is available free of charge to LIFE for any public message LIFE may wish to present.

"Copy and any photos for this full page LIFE advertisement should be prepared immediately because the printer will need to have the material no later than September 4, Monday.

"Please let us know how we may be of service."

The Social Planners Worry When the American People Are Prosperous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just what is really behind the social planners who are the chief economic advisers to the President, may be hinted at in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal. Most of the economic proposals sponsored by the present administration are not designed to maintain a strong, healthy, and free economy—rather they all call for extending welfare programs and Federal controls. The editorial, which I include herewith, shows that the chief worry of Walter Heller, top economic adviser to President Kennedy, is a "strong and buoyant recovery" of our economy. Good times, a sound economy may thwart Mr. Heller's plans to further regiment our people.

The editorial follows:

MR. HELLER'S NEW WORRY

The economy is headed toward a "strong and buoyant recovery," says Walter Heller, President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. But instead of cheering him up this has given Mr. Heller a new worry.

Now he sees the danger, unless something is done about it, of a violent swing from the large deficit in prospect for this fiscal year to a sizeable budget surplus in the next fiscal years. Hence, he thinks we should have rising expenditures in order to avoid "excessive fiscal contraction" that might be caused by that surplus.

In answering complaints about the rapid expansion of spending this year, the administration has blamed it all on Berlin and the necessity to offset the recession. But wait until next year, officials have been telling us; then the present \$5.3 billion deficit will be offset by a nice surplus.

Well, fiscal 1963 is looming, and sure enough, the Treasury thinks there might be a budget surplus on the basis of present spending levels if business keeps booming. But now this surplus, deemed so desirable so recently, is regarded as dangerous. Never mind that the recession, which was formerly the excuse for spending, is plainly becoming buoyant recovery. The Government has a duty to increase spending further to protect us from that terrible threat raised by the recovery; namely, fiscal contraction.

So there you are. If there isn't one reason for spending more, there's another. In a slump you have to have big spending in order to get a deficit. In recovery you have to have big spending in order to keep from having a surplus.

But we really don't think Mr. Heller needs to worry. With so many dutiful people in Washington these days, we doubt if there's any danger of a violent swing—or even a timid gesture—toward Government economy.

Migrant Workers' Facilities in Bangor, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I have heretofore noted we have heard much about the situation of the migrant workers and of possible solutions for their problems. Mr. Andrew Donovan of Bangor, Mich., has set about the matter in a refreshing and typically American way.

He has constructed on his farm a model migrant center, really a self-contained town, with a store and barbershop and outdoor recreation facilities. This summer he has housed 125 workers in his town and expects to expand it by next summer to take care of 500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD several news stories reporting on Mr. Donovan's migrant center. One from the Benton Harbor News-Palladium, July 19, 1961, one from the Bangor (Mich.) Advance of July 20, 1961, and one from the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune of July 15, 1961:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune, July 15, 1961]

MIGRANT WORKER CENTER SOUTH OF BANGOR WILL EVENTUALLY HOUSE 500

(By Jack Stroud, Tribune reporter)

A model migrant center, a self-contained town, is now under construction on the Donovan Lake Farm owned by Andrew Donovan of rural Bangor. Housing for 125 workers will be available this year and space for 500 within the next 5 years.

The town will have its own barbershop and store, in addition to the living quarters, and

plans are underway for a complete recreation program such as the organization of a baseball team, once a week movies, and Sunday religious services.

According to Donovan, who has been in the farming industry all his life, he has been studying the migrant housing problem for the past 7 years and pointed out that actual adequate housing in the area would not take care of 10 percent of all the laborers who annually move in to help with the harvest. He noted, however, that housing for migrants had been improving over the past 3 years.

Another innovation of the town is a central kitchen where all laborers will be fed from a balanced menu which was inspected this week by a dietitian from the State health department. The menu takes into account the type of work being done and proper diet for such work.

Donovan intends to use the laborers for his own harvest and after that is finished they will be available to other area farmers while remaining at the Donovan Farm. This is contrary to the general practice which is to dismiss the help once the harvest has been completed.

The Donovan Farm now covers 350 acres and is located about 4¼ miles south of Bangor on the Town Line Road. The owner said he will have need for the 500 laborers himself for his cherry harvest in the next 5 years.

The native Bangorite pointed out that there is only one other known center like this one and that one is in New Jersey. The housing on the Bangor farm now consists of a two-story dwelling along with three 20- by 25-foot one-story bunkhouses which house 22 laborers in double bunks.

He has announced plans to employ mostly male help who are recruited from the Orlando, Fla., area, although many of them come from other States. He said that there should be sufficient work in the area to keep them busy until November.

Donovan observed that the center is rapidly becoming as much of a showplace as anything and is averaging from 20 to 30 visitors daily, many of them farmers like himself.

Henry Florian of the Michigan State Employment Security Commission, offered the opinion that the center should aid greatly in keeping workers in the area. He noted that under the past method, many good workers have moved out due to the lack of housing.

One of the crops which almost annually encounters a labor shortage is the blueberry crop where the last picking often falls after Labor Day when the majority of the workers have left the area.

Donovan noted that in the event that mechanical harvesting reaches the point where laborers are no longer needed, the building can always be converted to other purposes.

[From the Benton Harbor (Mich.) News-Palladium, July 19, 1961]

MIGRANT TOWN TO HOUSE 500—MODEL CENTER BEING BUILT ON DONOVAN FARM

BANGOR.—A model migrant center which will be a self-contained town is now under construction on the Donovan Lake Farm.

Owner Andrew Donovan of rural Bangor said housing for 125 workers will be available this year and space for 500 within the next 5 years.

The town will have its own barbershop, store, along with the living quarters. A recreation program, including baseball, and movies, will be offered. Religious services will be held on Sundays.

Donovan, who has been a farmer all of his life, has been making a study of migrant housing problems for 7 years. He said the actual adequate housing in the area would not take care of 10 percent of the laborers who move in annually to help with the

harvest. He believes, however, that housing for migrants has been improving over the last 3 years.

Donovan's plan calls for a central kitchen where laborers will be fed a balanced menu which is based on the nature of the work performed.

After the harvest is completed on Donovan's 350-acre farm, he will allow them to remain on his property even though they wish to assist other growers.

Owner Donovan said he knows of only one other similar type operation. He said it is in New Jersey.

Currently, the Donovan farm has a two-story dwelling which is divided into three one-story bunkhouses.

Henry Florian, a representative of the Michigan State Employment Security Commission, offered an opinion that he thought the center would keep employable farmhands in the area. Blueberry growers face labor shortages when late pickings fall after Labor Day.

Donovan said the building could be converted to other uses if mechanical picking ever replaces the migrants.

[From the Hartford (Mich.) Day Spring, July 20, 1961]

NEW TYPE OF FARM LABOR CAMP OPENS, HOUSING 125 ON ANDREW DONOVAN FARM—DORMITORIES TAKE PLACE OF SINGLE CABINS

A new concept in housing of temporary farm labor is being tried this year by Andrew Donovan, and so far it has proved an unqualified success.

Donovan has built a labor camp housing 125 workers on his farm northeast of Hartford. Liberal use of white paint and wall-board has transformed a former cowbarn into an attractive dining hall, kitchen and offices. Metal-covered pole type buildings have been erected for dormitories.

All of the 125 workers are Negroes. Except for six couples, the group is composed of single men. Donovan said that he plans to provide more housing for couples by next year.

The new camp went into use 2 weeks ago, and Donovan said that so far there has not been a single argument. In describing the reaction of the workers to the facilities which Donovan has provided, Crew Leader Clarence Jones said, "They're crazy about it." LeRoy Mixon, who has picked fruit in many areas, says the Donovan camp offers the best facilities he has seen.

Working through State farm labor offices, Jones recruits the workers in the South, mostly in Florida. Nearly all of them are experienced fruit pickers. Besides working in Donovan's 350 acres of fruit, the workers are hired out by the day to other farmers in the area. Donovan said that every grower who has used his workers have asked for them back again.

In Donovan's camp, the former cowbarn not only houses the dining hall and kitchen, but also a concession stand, a store, and a barbershop. A commercial laundry provides pickup and delivery service. The dining hall also serves as a recreation area and is equipped with a jukebox and shuffleboard game.

Donovan employs one man full time on cleaning and another as a night watchman who patrols the camp, particularly to watch for fire. The county health department and State fire marshal's office have assisted him in building the camp.

All workers in the camp are required to pay \$12.50 a week for board, which provides them with three meals a day. In just 2 weeks, Donovan said, the men have begun to gain weight. A baseball field adjoins the camp, and Donovan has provided equipment for the sport.

By providing work on both his own farm and others, Donovan can offer employment to

the present group of workers until November 1. He predicted that his camp may expand to the point that it will be housing 500 workers 5 years from now.

Donovan freely admits that his previous housing for temporary labor was as bad as anybody's; maybe worse. The new camp is in direct contrast to the rows of one-room shacks that long have been the typical housing on southwestern Michigan farms.

AREA LABOR CAMP IDEA APPEARS TO BE SUCCESSFUL

An unique experiment in migrant labor is going on virtually unheralded within a stone's throw of Bangor. Actually it is an attempt to improve migrant working, and living conditions. The method is commonly known as a labor camp.

However, the migrant labor camp located on the Andrew Donovan farm, south of Bangor on Town Line Road, is actually a small city located amidst the rolling hills covered with fruit bearing trees. Another way of describing it would be to compare it to an Army post of the World War II era. Donovan's as yet unnamed camp, is complete with kitchen, messhall, barracks-type sleeping quarters, snackbar, library, clothing store, latrine, laundry facilities, and private quarters for married couples.

While it is still too early to tell whether Donovan's experiment is going to be successful, there is every indication that it will be. The secret is in obtaining the good will of the people living in the camp. If they take an interest in it and want to make it go for their own benefit, then it will be successful. Donovan thinks he has achieved this. From the attitude of the people living in the camp he apparently has.

Labor camps and the migrant living therein are different from the typical run of the mill migrant house which dominates the area now.

Donovan contracts for his pickers through the U.S. Department of Labor. Most of his workers come from the Deep South, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. All of them are colored.

Elmer Sampson is typical of those living in the camp. He comes from Baltimore, Md. He couldn't find work in his home State, so he joined the ranks of the migrant worker out of sheer desperation. He doesn't like being away from his family but it is work and this means food and clothing.

All of Donovan's dealings are with the labor contractor and crew leader. "I deal with him and he in turn deals with the pickers," Donovan said. It is his responsibility to recruit the workers, get them here and return them to their homes at the end of the season.

As far as Donovan knows, his is the only labor camp of this type in Michigan. Health department workers have told him that the only similar type camp that they know of is located in New Jersey.

What is camp life like as seen through the eyes of the migrant worker living in the camp? And what is it that appeals to him? What makes it better than shifting from one migrant housing to the next?

At Donovan's camp the pickers are aroused at about 4:30 a.m., depending of course upon the crop being harvested. Music piped from a jukebox located in the dining room through loudspeakers into the compound area is used to signal the start of another working day. The worker files through a chowline much like those used in the Army. He eats in a large dining room and then leaves for the field. At 11 a.m. hot meals are brought to him wherever he is working. The pickers usually work a 10- to 12-hour day during the peak of the harvest. When the workday is completed they return to the camp area and their respective barracks or bunkhouses where they have time to wash and clean up before supper. Sup-

per is served in the dining room. For this the worker pays Donovan \$12.50 a week. This money comes from the wages the worker received. The money is not taken from his pay. The grower pays the crew leader for the work performed and the crew leader in turn pays the worker, who then pays the camp for his room and board. The worker can collect his money either weekly or daily. The choice is up to him.

Following supper he is free to visit the snackbar, which is well stocked with many items including coffee, ice cream, bakery goods, etc., borrow books from the lending library or spend some time in the combination dining room and lounge.

Kitchen help supplied by Donovan is in charge of planning the menu, which meets with the health department requirements. The menus allow \$1.20 per day per person as the cost to feed the worker. This allows for ample amounts of food. It isn't fancy food, but there is plenty of it. There is no reason for anyone to finish a meal hungry. Many of the people in the camp will tell you it has been this way in other places they have worked. In most cases pickers working for a labor contractor have had to furnish their own food. "In past years I have seen pickers put a chunk of bologna between stale bread and call it dinner," Donovan said. A man simply cannot turn in a full day's work when he doesn't get enough to eat. A hungry worker is not a happy worker.

A typical day's menu at the labor camp consists of pancakes, sausage, sirup, and coffee for breakfast. The noon meal consists of neck bone, cabbage, rice, baked bread, and coffee. For dinner last Saturday evening workers were served liver, mashed potatoes, sweetpeas, biscuits, and coffee.

The housing facilities consist of three single-story and one double-story bunkhouse. The single-story units can sleep a total of 58 pickers. The double-story unit can house 52 men. In addition there are eight private quarters for married couples. Donovan plans for a total of 125 pickers. There are 60 in the camp now.

The bunkhouses are of pole-type construction and covered with metal roofing and sides. Native lumber was used inside of the buildings. Each bunkhouse is swept out daily and scrubbed two times weekly.

At night the area is patrolled by a watchman, who also does cleanup work about the camp. It takes about 10 people to run the camp efficiently. Five women are employed in the camp kitchen, a maintenance man is needed to keep the area in general repair, one office man to aid in record keeping, and a woman to run the snackbar and clothing store. There is also a room for a barbershop which now has a chair in it. Donovan hopes to have it in operation within a short while. As soon as he runs across a worker who can cut hair to the satisfaction of those living in the camp it will be in operation.

Recreation is a problem. A ball diamond is being built behind the camp now. Plus that, there is room for dancing and various types of machine-operated games, such as bowling, etc. Once a week, Donovan tries to organize some sort of party or entertainment. He hopes to obtain a movie once a week and plans to install a television set in the dining hall.

Most of the work is done in the camp by the pickers themselves. "It is up to them, they can make this place as nice as they want it," Donovan said.

How do the pickers feel about it? Most of them will tell you that they like it fine. "It's just like home," one of the kitchen workers said. "We are happy." In some cases the labor camp is probably better than home ever was. "At first some of the workers were dissatisfied with the setup, but when they learned that nobody was trying to rob or cheat them and when they started getting

their stomachs full, the grumbles and discontentment declined to a minimum," Donovan said.

As of yet the camp hasn't been named. "They want me to give it a name, but I told them, 'It's your camp, you name it.'" As a result a contest is now being conducted in the camp to find a suitable name.

While it is too early to really tell how the labor camp idea will turn out, indications are that it is going to be successful. If it isn't, it won't be because Donovan hasn't tried his level best to make it so. He's done just about everything he can. The rest of it is up to the people living there.

Women's Suffrage

SPEECH OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the Record a few observations in connection with the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, providing women the right to vote.

It has been a long time, even for those who remember it well, since the suffragettes paraded before the White House in the dead of winter with their placards and refused President Wilson's invitation to come inside to get warm for fear accepting it would admit frailty and consequently jeopardize their crusade.

Women at the polls greatly altered the world of politics. In the last 41 years, certainly women as voters, as political workers, and as elective officeholders, have had a profound influence on our national legislation, especially in the fields of education, child labor, social welfare, and social justice. There can be no question of their interest in the affairs of our Nation and the world. Men are no longer condescending in their attitude toward women voters and women politicians. We have developed a hearty respect for the majority of them and are grateful for their contributions to our public life.

Perhaps the caliber of women active in politics has been the greatest single factor in our maturing attitude. No longer are we confronted with Suffragettes in severe mannish dresses and stern impassioned faces. We have the happy privilege of working with women who are true to their feminine heritage even in the midst of the most heated political debate. No better example of the fine caliber of women currently on the national political scene can be found than the senior Senator from my State of Maine, a former Member of this House, the Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH. It may seem inappropriate for a freshman Member of Congress, such as myself, to call to your attention a woman who has compiled an enviable record in her 20 years in the House and Senate and has built a national reputation for capable and knowledgeable performance. However, it is certainly ap-

propriate that any male Member of Congress marvel at the ability of Senator SMITH and the other women Members of Congress who engage in this demanding and often shrewdly calculating business of politics, and yet retain those attributes we admire in the female sex.

The accomplishments of the many women in public life and the responsible and informed attitude toward voting by women in general, is indeed, and in itself, a fitting tribute to those who had the foresight 41 years ago to ratify the 19th amendment.

United States Should Not Tolerate Waste of Atom Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Record an editorial from the Modesto Bee, Modesto, Calif., concerning the Hanford plutonium reactor.

The Modesto Bee is a member of the McClatchy newspaper group, which is one of the leading independent newspaper chains in the Nation. In my opinion, the editorial quite accurately represents the majority thinking of the people of central California on this proposal.

Although the House has twice acted unfavorably on this project, I would hope that we would have another opportunity to vote this year on this important issue, and that the earlier rollcall votes will be reversed.

Following is the text of the editorial:

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT TOLERATE WASTE OF ATOM ENERGY

Behind the scenes in Washington, D.C., an epochal battle is going on over a proposed appropriation to construct the world's largest atomic power plant at the Government's plutonium works in Hanford, Wash.

It would utilize atomic wastes which could be harnessed to develop 11 million pounds of steam every hour of the day and night. This would generate 750,000 kilowatts of electricity. To produce an equivalent amount in a conventional steam plant would take 7 million barrels of fuel oil a year.

Yet, notwithstanding this tremendous waste, the appropriation is being fought bitterly by the lobby for the private power interests. Oddly enough, no private company has shown any interest in building the atomic plant. The power lobby simply is determined to block out any and all public power, whether generated by hydro, fuel oil or atomic energy.

Speaking in Seattle last Monday, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall sensibly declared in referring to the Hanford plant:

"America cannot afford to waste its resources, be they of the land or of man's scientific ingenuity."

Indeed it is little short of a crime that this vast amount of energy should continue to waste down the Columbia River when the Pacific Northwest by the best calculations

will be 117,000 kilowatts short of its firm power requirements by 1965.

Also the electricity from the Hanford reactor could feed into the proposed transmission intertie which would link the Pacific Northwest and southern California in a transmission grid.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, said failure to utilize the heat generated at the Hanford reactor for beneficial purposes would be completely indefensible. Even stronger were the words of John McCone, the AEC Chairman under former President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"To waste the great amount of heat produced at Hanford, to fail to utilize it, would be a vast disservice to the people."

And U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, in a speech on the Senate floor said that in building this, the largest dual purpose plant in the world, "America might point to leadership in this field. Prestige—or respect—is an important item in the life of nations today."

It is possible that in the long run America would achieve even greater respect and prestige in the eyes of the people of the world this way than it would in being the first to send a man to the moon, and at a great deal lower cost.

Paul Harvey on Spending Ourselves to Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as I have consistently pointed out, we are in far greater danger of destroying ourselves through irresponsible spending than of losing our freedoms through outright attack by the Soviet Union. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include a powerful statement delivered by the newscaster, Paul Harvey, over the American Broadcasting Co. network last Saturday:

SPEED AND POWER ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS—EXCERPTS FROM PAUL HARVEY NEWS, AUGUST 26, 1961

West Germany's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has, for almost a century now, guessed right.

He says, "The Berlin crisis will not spark a war."

He says, "Russia is preparing for 20 years of cold war, instead."

The Soviet Communist Party is scheduled to meet in Moscow in October.

The announced agenda is "a 20-year plan", to supplant the previous 5-year plans.

Britain agrees with Adenauer.

Britain is keeping Britain strong.

The British Government has ordered an austerity program intended to conserve Britain's resources.

Britain has even ordered reduced military spending, reduced budget for NATO, reduced foreign aid. Keep the money at home.

Britain has ordered reduced imports, reduced total foreign spending 20 percent, keep the money at home.

Britain has ordered, on the homefront, no more wage increases, throttle credit, tax capital gains, increase luxury taxes 10 percent thus to prevent runaway inflation, to have economic power for the long uphill pull.

And the British people are, with only

minor objections, willing to interrupt the best years of their lives to tighten their belts and hold the line in the cold war with the same bulldog determination with which they have held the line in hot wars.

But while Russia is planning for 20 years of building Russia, and while Britain, wisely, is husbanding her resources, President Kennedy has decreed for us easier home loan credit, increased oversea extravagance, increased imports.

On the homefront we persist in round after round of wage increases, loose credit; our dollars are worth less and less as the cost of living continues to shatter every previous record high.

All this because we've let Khrushchev scare us into preparing for hot war.

Thus to exhaust our resources mobilizing men and refinancing our sometimes friends and dissipating our energies and dashing off toward the moon while he lays plans to inherit the earth.

It seems the American people are brainwashed to accept any extravagance if it is camouflaged in olive drab.

Massive subsidies for schools because we've got to catch the Russian sputnik.

Wasteful glut of stored foodstuffs, rotting in warehouses, because this is ammunition in the food for peace giveaway.

Accelerate the highway programs in all directions because we must prepare for war.

Meanwhile our domestic welfare handouts make the United States a paradise for parasites.

While the President urges hard work and physical fitness on one hand, on the other hand he seeks to increase the cash reward for the indigent, the lazy and the leeches who are unwilling to work.

We have a \$3.9 billion dollar deficit just behind us and another \$5 billion dollars worth staring us in the face.

All this bleeding red ink we do in the name of preparedness.

Preparedness for what?

For dime dollars, fiscal collapse and cold war defeat?

Your car is geared either for speed or for power, you can't have both.

This race with the Communists is a marathon race, not a hundred yard dash.

Unless we pace ourselves, we'll poop ourselves.

We will utterly exhaust ourselves if we intend to sprint from here to the next election, while our enemies are making plans for the next generation.

Holmes Alexander Views the "Lunatic Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Holmes Alexander recently undertook to identify a group he refers to as the "lunatic left" and having identified the group, he went on to comment on predictable actions and reactions of this species. Mr. Alexander has given an insight into something that deserves the attention of this country and I should like to insert his column, "The Lunatic Left," as it appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 17, in the RECORD at this point.

THE LUNATIC LEFT

(By Holmes Alexander)

Names are news, as the reporter learns first and had better not forget, but there are occasional stories which can best be written about nameless, faceless men.

Call them the "lunatic leftists." It is important that we know them as a class of men, know them by their reactions, so that we can (since these men are not branded, as they ought to be, upon the forehead) recognize them and walk wide.

The story is timely. During June, July, and August the emergence of "lunatic leftism" has become the most significant development of the session. Busy at covering other yarns, I am not fully filled in on the dramatis personae, but I expect to be using names the next time around.

Meanwhile, from books, and at the feet of wiser men, and out of some years of using my own feet around town, I think I can name the one distinguishing characteristic of the "lunatic left" that never fails to show.

It is this—national patriotism is abhorrent to them. This is why they were implacable toward fascism, but are characteristically soft on communism.

Many of them, closing the gates of mercy on Germans and Japanese, 1939-45, participated in the development of the atomic bomb and supported the "war criminal" trials after World War II, but flinched (or worse) from treating our Red enemies the same way.

Many who called for unconditional surrender in the 1940's were soon falling back in horror when MacArthur wanted to bomb Red China and win the Korean war. The same ones enjoyed the route of Batista and gloated over the assassination of Trujillo, but would not have us lay a hand on Castro.

It is vain to show a lunatic leftist that some rightist dictators are pro-American and that practically all leftist dictators are anti-American.

It is equally vain to show a lunatic leftist that in brutality, inhumaneness and immorality, the Communists are the worst offenders—or certainly as bad as the worst—in all history. I have never known a lunatic leftist, for example, who would fully accept a truly tough indictment of communism.

Here is one taken from the new biography of Khrushchev, "The Grand Tactician" by Lazar Pistrak. The author is building up to Khrushchev's rise to power by suppressing workers' strikes, disciplining farmers, constructing the Moscow subway with forced labor, much as the Pharaohs produced the Pyramids.

The author writes:

"It would be a fascinating task to compare the tribute in sweat, tears, and blood, which subjugated peoples have paid to their mother countries, with the tribute the Soviet people have paid to their own Government . . . so that it could surpass the world . . . The price paid so far by the (Russian) people has been high, certainly much higher, than a subjugated people ever paid to a conqueror."

The "lunatic leftist" reacts almost similarly when he distinguishes between liberals and conservatives at home. The leftist finds little or no fault with presidents and populist leaders who demand that the people be given womb-to-tomb federalized care—no matter if that means torturing the Constitution and endangering the Republic.

But the leftist falls to trembling with fear and rage at the conservatives who quote things like the Farewell Address and the federalist papers, who insist upon loyalty oaths for those who serve the government or take its scholarships, and who assert that the war against communism is a total war, fought in our midst as well as at the front.

"Lunatic leftists" are not traitors—but they are antipatriots. They are not Com-

munists—but they can't abide anticommunism.

American nationalism is always opposed by the lunatic leftists who, of course, support internationalism in all its forms. Foreign aid, which diminishes the American Commonwealth, and every sort of reduction of American sovereignty, are things of glory to the "lunatic left."

Every breakdown of American custom, every abandonment of American advantage in military or trade barriers—all these are welcomed as manna falling from heaven upon the leftist.

I have often thought—and I now propose—that persons described above should be challenged when they take the oath to "uphold the Constitution of the United States." For this oath is, or should be, preclusive.

It is a vow to "uphold the Constitution"—and to uphold nothing else besides. Not the United Nations, not the party platform, not anything else at all.

Puerto Rican Board of Guardians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENGO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ZELENGO. Mr. Speaker, a group of dedicated citizens of New York City, under the chairmanship of William J. vanden Heuvel, has commenced a dynamic program to aid Americans of Puerto Rican descent.

The New York Times of Wednesday, August 30, 1961, in a most significant article, details this vital program. The article follows:

A campaign to raise \$225,000 to start a vigorous program for the Puerto Rican Board of Guardians to combat delinquency and to aid the city's Puerto Ricans was announced yesterday.

The effort is being modeled on work of the Jewish Board of Guardians here for the last 60 years.

William J. vanden Heuvel, chairman of the Puerto Rican organization, said it had operated on only a small scale with volunteers since its incorporation by Mrs. Stella Davis, a social worker, in 1955. It has only \$1,500 to \$2,000 in the bank, he said, but will now seek community and foundation support for a program in a dozen fields.

Top priority will go to help Puerto Rican children in difficulties, and "we hope their first contact with the law will be with a friend," Mr. Vanden Heuvel said. He spoke at a news conference at the Overseas Press Club, 54 West 40th Street.

CONSULTATIONS UNDERWAY

Consultations have already been underway with the city's Domestic Relations Court and Youth Board. The agency's basic operation would start with an executive director of Puerto Rican descent and six caseworkers in Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens, costing \$50,000 a year, including office expenses.

Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman of the executive committee of the Puerto Rican group, issued a report that said 85 to 95 percent of the city's Puerto Ricans—now about 750,000 persons—had "always been completely self-supporting." While the census classifies only 7 percent of Puerto Ricans as Negroes, the report said, "the majority are discriminated against as if they belonged to the Negro race."

Cultural differences cause difficulties, Mr. Biddle said. In Puerto Rico, women are more strictly supervised and restricted; because of New York's industrial needs, more Puerto Rican women have become employed here than men, reducing the husband's status. Both parents must work because of high rents, and emotional problems then arise for children.

Mr. Biddle's report said Puerto Ricans had "outstanding" qualities—family responsibility, less materialism than most groups, lack of prejudice about skin color, a deep sense of individual dignity.

Projects envisioned by the board include summer camping for 400 boys, \$30,000; public information and fund-raising, \$35,000; five fellowships in social work, \$10,000; job-finding, \$10,000; 25 college scholarships, \$25,000; a study of Puerto Rican children in the city's schools, \$10,000; home economics courses, \$12,000; a remedial reading project, \$5,000; English and orientation courses, \$15,000; three youth clubs, \$13,000; financial help in emergencies, \$10,000.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the July 28 issue of the Journal of Commerce carried the fifth in the series on the administration's economic programs.

This article is concerned with public power policy:

ADMINISTRATION FOLLOWS PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The major locus of unadulterated left of center thinking in the Kennedy administration today appears beyond question to be in Stewart Udall's Department of the Interior.

It was in this very area of electric power, water and land development, over which Mr. Udall now exercises dominion, that the Eisenhower administration made perhaps its most valiant effort to reverse the 20-year Democratic trend toward concentration of power in Washington. Mr. Udall has reversed it right back.

POWER COMPLAINTS

True, the extreme advocates of Federal control over the development of natural resources are complaining a bit. They want to know, for example, why the administration has done nothing about starting a truly national public power system by construction of electrical intertie lines linking the various huge Government power generating facilities across the country.

But they will concede that they are, on the whole, well enough pleased with the New Frontier.

Businessmen are, in the same proportion, fearful and worried.

The administration's most meaningful steps, thus far, have been taken in the field of Government power generation and marketing. Expansion of Federal activity elsewhere in the resource development area is still largely on the bureaucratic drawing boards.

Three significant decisions have been made on public power:

The administration has asked for funds to finance Government construction of an atomic-fueled power generating plant at the Hanford, Wash., atomic installation. The issue is still before Congress—and the outcome in doubt.

The decision to ask for funds for the Hanford facility represents a sharp break with the Eisenhower administration policy of cooperating with industry in the development of atomic-fueled power but allowing industry to construct any plant for generation of power for commercial sale.

COLORADO PROJECT

The Government has proposed the construction of a power transmission grid from the upper Colorado River project, undoing, in the process, an Eisenhower administration-utility Company agreement for private transmission of the power.

What is publicly billed as a reregulating dam—for flood control purposes—on the upper Snake River in Idaho is in the works. But private utility companies claim that the dam's main purpose will really be power generation and that the decision to undertake it came about because the presently existing dams were not generating sufficient power to meet the needs of municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and other "preference customers" in the area.

PRECEDENT SEEN

The Idaho Power Co. had expressed its willingness to supply the additional power needed but the Government decision to proceed with the construction of another Federal dam is seen as establishing the precedent—for the first time outside the Tennessee Valley Authority region—that Government dams will meet all the needs of "preference customers."

There are hints of even further actions in the direction of bigger public power programs. On the very point on which the public power advocates are complaining—the lack of any steps to interconnect existing public power areas—utility spokesmen here have some questions.

They note the recent approval of the largest-ever Rural Electrification Administration co-op generating facility in Indiana, a region which has been a significant blank spot on the public power map. They figure that Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is cooperating with Secretary Udall in this, with bigger plans ahead than meet the eye.

That there has been a step-up in REA activities is unargued. Those who favor it speak glowingly of the help local REA co-ops are now receiving from Washington in planning expansion of already-existing systems. Those who oppose it claim that REA actually has teams of workers in the field drumming up REA co-op interest in expanded facilities.

NEW PROGRAMS FEARED

As for giant basinwide development of rivers, along the lines of TVA, while this has not been revived, as such, there are considerable fears that just such programs might grow out of legislation now pending before Congress authorizing the creation of a National Water Resources Council and river basin commissions.

Substantial expansion of Federal Government land holdings—and administration of these lands—is implicit in a number of proposals ranging from conservation of underdeveloped regions in their natural wild state to plans for creation of more urban parklands.

The Eisenhower administration's "Mission 66," originally conceived as a program, to be completed by 1966, for improvement of national parks which had fallen into decay during World War II may be used for some expansion of the park system, too.

Government plans—unofficial as yet—for rehabilitation of so-called small woodlands—5,000 acres or less—are seen by the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce, for one, as a Government land grab.

There is some question of whether changes are in the offing concerning mineral rights—whether the administration may not attempt to put all minerals in federally owned areas under leasing, as oil and gas are, rather than granting outright patents.

The Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Father Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., associate professor of History at Fordham University, one of the great Jesuit institutions of learning in America, in a recent letter published in the Washington Post, has struck the nail on the head as far as the real issue before the world is concerned.

With the clarity and logic so typical of the majority of Jesuits, Father Clancy has brought into focus the manner in which communism should be attacked and the master of the Kremlin exposed.

This is a job that the U.S. Information Service under Edward R. Murrow should do without delay. This is not propaganda. This is asking a simple answer to a simple question.

This country and its educational institutions needs more Father Clancys. Here is his letter:

FREEING ALL CAPTIVES

Your perceptive editorial of July 20 wherein you remark "that even if the Berlin crisis subsides . . . the central challenge will remain," is the occasion for this letter. I have also been motivated by President Kennedy's courageous speech of July 25 in which he stated that he is determined to abandon a merely negative type of foreign policy.

In this same talk the President was kind enough to invite the participation of his fellow Americans in forging a positive program for international affairs. My suggestions are as follows:

It seems to me that the tension now surrounding the Berlin question could be considerably lessened if Mr. Kennedy, instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline of December 31, would set an earlier deadline of his own. Since Moscow has chosen to raise the Berlin issue why should not Washington insist on the right of East Germany to self-determination in free elections? This was promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955.

And while our Chief Executive is on the question of freedom, he ought to press for similar rights for all the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. Their rights, too, have been guaranteed by the solemn treaties that have been consistently violated by the Communists since the close of World War II. Berlin, far from being our Achilles heel, is rather an opening to the heart of captured Europe. Freedom is indivisible, and the fate of Berlin is inseparably linked with that of Eastern Europe.

An international conference with or without Khrushchev, should be held not merely about Berlin, but about Germany and Eastern Europe as well. If the master of the

Kremlin refuses to attend this conference, the West should resort to political warfare in an effort to change his mind. This could take the form of economic sanctions.

The fact of the matter is that the Communist bloc is much more dependent on trade from the West. Grain from the United States, factories from Britain, steel and ships from West Germany, are products that help build a strong Communist empire. I am advocating a complete embargo on East-West trade with concurrent explanations of Western aims by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This might well make Khrushchev think seriously about keeping his promises. The West cannot do less for freedom's sake.

Leo Cherne's remarks last month on the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt are pertinent to the current crisis, and are deserving of frequent quotation. He declared that "if freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom [i.e., Europeans] are permitted to remain slaves."

HERBERT J. CLANCY, S.J.,
Associate Professor of American History,
Fordham University, New York.

Inconsistency of Bureaucratic Farm Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of Government planned and regimented farming is indicated in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

NEW FARM SURPLUS

As one way of inducing farmers to grow less corn, the planners in the Department of Agriculture last spring decided to encourage them to plant more soybeans. Obviously, the way to accomplish this was to raise the guaranteed price of beans. It was boosted 45 cents to \$2.30 a bushel, the highest support level for this crop in 8 years.

Soybeans are the fifth most important cash crop American farmers produce. But unlike corn and wheat, soybeans up to now have been free of surpluses, and market prices at times have been far above support levels. By the end of the current marketing year (September 30), the carryover of soybeans from last year's crop probably will be no more than 5 million bushels.

Now, however, crop forecasters are talking about a record soybean crop of 700 million bushels, which would be a fifth larger than the previous record crop in 1958. By the end of the 1962 marketing year the carryover from a crop that big could be as much as 120 million bushels. Most of it could end up in Government hands under price support operations at a cost to taxpayers of up to a quarter of a billion dollars.

The inconsistency here should be obvious to taxpayers, even if it is not apparent to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and his chief economic planner, Prof. Willard W. Cochrane. The Government is paying farmers not to grow corn and other feed grains to reduce the surplus, while guaranteeing them higher prices to overproduce

soybeans. Thus a new surplus is being created and bureaucratic management is being extended to a commodity that was doing all right in the marketplace before the planners of the New Frontier interfered.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Program—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, regulation of industry is the subject of the sixth in the series of Eileen Shanahan articles on the Kennedy economic programs. This article appeared on July 31.

KENNEDY CONTROL VIEWS PUZZLING

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the Nation's thousands of businessmen, probably none have been so apprehensive concerning their fate under the Kennedy Administration as those under direct regulation by the Government.

Their fears commenced long before Inauguration Day—and not without reason. They continue to exist—also not without reason.

UNCERTAIN FUTURE

But just exactly what lies ahead for the transport, communications and other regulated industries still remains far from clear, though there are increasing signs that it may be different things for different ones.

The temptation to lump together in one package all regulated industries—and all regulatory agencies—is strong. But it can also be misleading.

This fact was clearly enough recognized by James M. Landis—whose preinauguration assignment by Mr. Kennedy to the chore of figuring out ways of making regulation more effective, and whose continuing presence in the White House, has been the major single source of industry alarm. In his very first report, Mr. Landis drew significant distinctions among the agencies—ranking them, from his viewpoint, in a range roughly from fair to terrible.

OPINIONS VARY

Now, after 6 months, the reactions of the regulated industries themselves to the New Frontier regulatory commissions—some of them reorganized along the lines of Mr. Landis' proposals and some of them not—range from something bordering on complete delight on the part of the commercial airlines to something bordering on incoherent rage on the part of the broadcasting industry.

The regulated industry which knows the least about its future fate is maritime. Although the adoption of the reorganization plan is no longer in doubt, the identity of the new Commissioner is just a matter of rumor.

A lesser degree of uncertainty—though still a large one—prevails in the industries regulated by the Federal Power Commission, which is now completely controlled by Kennedy administration appointees but which has not, as yet, come forth with major trend-setting decisions.

In the field of ground transport, a very mixed picture exists. The influence and predictions of unfamiliar Commissioners remain untested.

No particular pattern emerges from decisions made to date.

The administration strongly backed heavier taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires, to finance the highway program—to the pleasure of the rails and the fury of the trucks.

The administration initiated a crackdown on contract carriers who illegally offer themselves as common carriers—something the licensed trucking lines have long wanted.

It has, to the satisfaction of the rail lines, advocated restriction of the bulk commodities exemption employed by barge lines.

But it also shook the confidence of many rail executives by its refusal to save the New Haven Railroad from bankruptcy.

Its tax proposal—since agreed to by the House Ways and Means Committee—to charge full tax at ordinary income rates on profits made from sales of depreciated property is potentially so costly to air and truck lines as to completely nullify, for them, the investment credit plan for business tax relief contained in the same White House package.

AIRLINES CONFIDENT

The airlines alone, among all the regulated industries, seem to feel that they have already seen enough to be confident of understanding treatment by their regulator—the Civil Aeronautics Board. The new CAB chairman, Alan E. Boyd, has let it be known that he is sympathetic to higher air fares and that he will encourage, rather than discourage mergers in an industry which he feels is overpopulated.

He has even—in the face of a generally internationalist trend in the administration as a whole—shown great sympathy with the U.S. lines' concern over growing foreign competition, although it is not yet certain that his activities in this direction are thoroughly known at the White House.

The questions ahead are literally endless. Is Newton Minow, the boy wonder of the Federal Communications Commission, just waiting for his second try at a reorganization plan to get through Congress before following up on his tough words by denying some radio station a license renewal? There are those in the broadcasting industry who fear so.

Is the ICC going to resolve the B. & O., C. & O., New York Central tangle under radical new criteria, involving examination of areawide transportation facilities?

To what extent is the Justice Department going to try to interpose its antitrust views on the regulatory agencies—exercising concurrent jurisdiction where it has it and influence where it doesn't?

To what extent may the courts continue their recent trend toward not interfering with regulatory agency "expertise" in the determination of the facts? Or may the courts possibly commence finding more flaws in the hatter decisions of the reorganized commissions.

Above all, are the regulated industries age-old pleas for speedier disposition of their cases going to be answered only with faster moves toward adverse conclusions?

It would be helpful if there were answers to these questions. But there aren't yet.

Amazing Export Policy of the Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I shall never understand or cease to be amazed by statements of Secretary of Commerce

Luther B. Hodges in connection with his Department's administration of the Federal Export Control Act of 1949. His most recent pronouncement of administration policy in this field occurred during a press conference on Tuesday, August 29. The Secretary stated that the United States is making "doubly sure" it sells nothing of strategic value to Communist countries, elaborating further, he went on to say, the Department of Commerce is exercising a "much tighter scrutiny" of license applications.

Finally, he said that the reason more licenses are being granted is because Department policy now demands quick "yes" or "no" answers to exporters requesting licenses for shipment to Iron Curtain countries and the Secretary attributes the increase in shipments to the speedup in decisionmaking. However, he concluded, the only licenses being granted are "for items demonstrably nonstrategic."

For the record, Mr. Speaker, let me cite the licenses issued, commodities involved, and the country of destination for the 2-week period immediately preceding the Secretary's press conference of August 29, starting with Monday, August 14 up to and including Friday, August 25:

Number issued	Country	Commodity description
21	Yugoslavia.....	Electron tubes. Processing vessels. Copper cable. Construction machinery and parts. Petroleum products. Copper scrap. Borates. Electronic testing machines and parts. Silicon. Automotive parts. Aircraft parts. Synthetic resins. Physical properties testing and inspecting machines. Iron and steel scrap. Semiconductors. Steel pipe. Synthetic lubricants. Semiconductors.
5	East Germany.....	Surgical and medical instruments. Cigar leaf tobacco. Technical data (patents filed).
6	Hungary.....	Synthetic resins. Technical data. Chemical specialties. Industrial sewing machine parts. Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.
8	U.S.S.R.....	Steel and iron staples. Textile machinery and parts. Bakery machinery and parts. Glass products. Manmade fiber and manufactures. Asbestos gaskets. Saw blades.
8	Cuba.....	Spanish radio transcriptions. Small red beans; dry, ripe. Technical data. Vertical record-filing cabinets. Malaria eradication commodities.
1	Bulgaria.....	Industrial chemicals.
2	Rumania.....	Resistors. Synthetic resins.
15	Czechoslovakia.....	Industrial chemicals. Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations. Industrial instrument and parts. Safety apparel and equipment. Geographical world globe. Rubber manufactures. Synthetic resins.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a very sorry record. Consider for a moment the commodities cleared for export in this 2-week period. Substantial quantities of iron and steel scrap, copper scrap, industrial machine parts, aircraft parts, construction machinery to name just a few. The question arises does the Secretary really think that the general public and the Members of this House are so naive as to believe these commodities are in fact nonstrategic? According to his quoted statements this must be the case. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action on my bill, H.R. 8547, which would bring an immediate stop to this traffic by barring all trade with Communist countries and bring an abrupt and timely halt to the activities of these so-called fast decision makers in the Department of Commerce. At the same time, I urge that House Resolution 403, reported out by the Rules Committee, which would establish a Select Committee of the House to investigate the Export Control Act of 1949, be immediately called up for consideration.

The sands of time are indeed running out. The hour grows late, and we can no longer afford to daily and procrastinate on matters that so seriously involve the security of the United States.

Excerpts of Remarks by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Prepared for Delivery at 26th Annual National Convention, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Hotel Utica, Utica, N.Y., Friday Evening, August 25, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, my city of Utica, N.Y., was recently host to the 26th Annual National Convention of Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc. In a memorable address on this occasion, the distinguished Governor of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, recounted the notable contributions of Americans of Italian descent to the defense and strengthening of our country. The Governor's expression of this proud heritage is a worthy tribute, recalling as it does the wide range of dedicated service. I am sure it will be of interest to every Member of this House:

First of all, my warm thanks to you for making me an honorary member of your organization during last year's convention. This is the first chance I've had to tell you how much I appreciate your generosity. It is a very great honor to be associated with a group which has contributed so much to America in war and in peace. In World War II, Italo-Americans were the largest ethnic group from New York to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces. Throughout America, the services mustered over 1,500,000 men of

Italian descent—over 10 percent of the might of America.

I share with you your pride in your heroes—including those Italo-Americans who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest decoration, for valor on the field of battle:

Pvt. Michael Valenti of the famous Lost Battalion of World War I, now the city marshal of Long Beach, N.Y.;

T. Sgt. Peter J. D'Alessandro, of Watervliet, N.Y., who won the Medal of Honor in World War II;

The immortal Sgt. John Basilone, of New Jersey, who won his first Medal of Honor with the Marines in the Pacific, was ordered back to the States as an instructor, insisted that he be returned to action—and died in battle on Iwo Jima, winning a second Medal of Honor posthumously;

Then there is Capt. Don Gentile, of Ohio, the leading American ace of World War II;

First Lt. Willibald C. Bianchi, of Minnesota, with the Philippine Scouts;

Pfc. Frank Petrarca, of Ohio, the gallant medic;

S. Sgt. Arthur F. deFranzo of Massachusetts—all of them Medal of Honor heroes.

I mention these men and I share your pride in them because they remind us all of the rich diversity of peoples which has made America great. They remind us that every group has important contributions to make to our society—that the real genius of America is the way it has brought all these groups together in the greatest free society on earth.

The Italian heritage of America, of the entire Western Hemisphere, is truly fabulous. It begins, of course, with the man who discovered it all, Christopher Columbus; and with other great explorers: Amerigo Vespucci, who gave the Americas their name; and Giovanni da Verrazano, who entered New York Bay almost a century before Henry Hudson, and whose name is preserved in the bridge now being built from Brooklyn to Staten Island.

It begins, too, with the less-known names—such as that of Peter Alberti, the Venetian who settled in the old colony on New York Bay in 1535—almost 90 years before the founding of the Dutch Province of the New Netherlands that ultimately became New York. He was our first Italian immigrant.

And then there was Col. Francis Vigo, who served on General Washington's staff in the Revolution, and later became the explorer of the Indiana Territory.

From these and many other pioneers come the beginnings of the rich Italian heritage that is interwoven in the heritage of all the New World. Wherever I have gone throughout the Western Hemisphere—in Caracas, in Sao Paulo, in Buenos Aires, in Lima, here in New York, the Midwest, on the west coast—I have witnessed the tremendous Italian contribution in business, in culture, and in the social and intellectual life of the community.

I think of a Giannini, the Italian immigrant boy who grew up to found the greatest bank in the United States; of the Matarazzos, the great industrial family of Brazil; of a President Arturo Frondizi in Argentina; of a Joe Martino, the New York industrialist who serves on the Port of New York Authority.

I had breakfast at my home in New York City last week with the most-decorated member of New York City's police force—and his name was Mario Blaggi. When the New York State Legislature met last Monday, it was Speaker Joe Carlini in command of the assembly majority—and Assemblyman Tony Travia leading the opposition.

Congressman PAUL FINO is my party's candidate for president of the New York City Council, Joe Periconi for borough president in the Bronx, John Marchi for borough

president on Staten Island. All through the politics of America, as in Governor Volpe of Massachusetts or Governor Di Salle of Ohio, Americans of Italian heritage are in roles of leadership.

In my own official family, Frank Votto heads the State division of veterans' affairs, Carl Spad is my appointments secretary, Tony Pittarelli is one of the staff of brilliant young lawyers in counsel's office who are my closest advisers on legislative matters. And Tony's immediate predecessor, I might add, was Fred Perrotta.

It is most fitting that in this free land, in this hemisphere of freedom, names of Italian origin should appear so frequently all across the spectrum of democratic leadership. For the New World importantly owes the development of the concepts of freedom and civilization to many outstanding Italians. From Dante to Marconi, from Raphael to Fermi, from Saint Francis to Benedetto Croce—in the arts and sciences, in poetry, philosophy and literature, in every branch of culture—and, above all, in deep principles of religious faith—the impact of Italian thought has been profound and enduring.

In a world where freedom is challenged as never before, both the Italian people in Europe and those of Italian descent in America stand as bulwarks on the side of liberty. Not once has the resurrected Italian nation faltered in its support of the dignity and freedom of mankind against the tyranny of atheistic communism. I emerged from a recent visit with Premier Fanfani with the conviction that it never will. And among the 3 million Italo-Americans of New York State, the 12 million Italo-Americans in the United States, no stronger friends of freedom and democracy, no firmer believers in the worth of the individual human being are to be found anywhere.

Yours, then, is a proud heritage—as Americans, as veterans, as men of faith and a rich background of infinite cultural variety. Such a heritage demands more than personal satisfaction: it summons each of you to personal dedication and high resolve to be worthy of it.

In a world divided between those who believe in human freedom and dignity and those who look on man as a cog in the machine of the all-powerful state, our choice is clear and our duty is clear.

The times call for steady nerves, for courageous determination that world freedom shall be preserved and extended.

The times demand that each of us shall work to build the strength and resolve of America on which the whole cause of freedom depends.

If we are to be true to the heritage of the past, if we are to build the brighter future that is within our grasp, we must work unceasingly, each in his own way, for the ultimate defeat of that soulless Communist statism that denies God and denies individual worth.

All that we are, all that we believe, all that we hope to become, is bound up in this great struggle. We must not fail, we cannot fail, we shall not fail.

Overdevelopment in Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into

the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the summer 1961 edition of *Western Outdoor Quarterly* entitled "Overdevelopment in Our National Parks," by Mr. Devereux Butcher, the editor and publisher of the *National Wildlands News*:

OVERDEVELOPMENT IN OUR NATIONAL PARKS

(By Devereux Butcher)

The national parks, as masterpieces of nature, are perfect and complete as they came from the hand of the Creator. Nothing we can do can make them more so. The introduction of hotels and extraneous diversions and distractions cannot increase our enjoyment of their beauty, for the preservation of which they have been established, and any alteration of their landscapes impairs their beauty—never enhances it.

During stagecoach days, travel was too slow to permit visitors to see more than a little of any one park in a single day. It was necessary, therefore, to build hotels and camps inside a park to enable visitors to remain long enough to see it adequately. Today, with smooth roads and quick transportation, it no longer is necessary for us to remain inside a park overnight. This is true even of the largest—Yellowstone.

Should we not, therefore, take advantage of this fact and remove all needless buildings from the parks' heartlands as rapidly as feasible? On the contrary, Mission 66, designed to take care of increasing numbers of visitors, is building more and larger hotels and motels and, in some instances even whole new villages, in the very landscapes that the parks are intended to keep unimpaired for future generations.

Exceptions are Great Smokey Mountains, Kings Canyon, Wind Cave and Acadia National Parks, which have no overnight accommodations; yet each is accessible for public enjoyment. Certain other parks, notably Olympic, Hawaii, and Mount McKinley have overnight accommodations on or close to their borders, their heartlands remaining intact. In these national parks the two directives of the National Park Service Act of 1916—to keep the parks unimpaired and to provide for their enjoyment—are in the closest possible harmony.

The same cannot be said of Yellowstone, Yosemite, Everglades, Grand Canyon, Mammoth Cave, and others, which contain resort centers, and Big Bend, where two new resorts are partly constructed. Many more parks have large hotels and other facilities in their heartlands. Why have the big construction projects of Mission 66 sprung up almost unnoticed by the groups and individuals who regard themselves as the defenders of the national parks?

During the past decade, two events captured our time and attention:

1. In the early part of the decade, there was the struggle to save Dinosaur National Monument from Echo Park Dam.

2. In the latter part of the 10-year period, the wilderness bill was introduced, and has been absorbing time and attention ever since.

Both of these events have deserved all of the attention they have been given; but we should not have become so diverted as to have ignored what has been happening to the National Parks. It is not enough to keep working for the preservation of new areas. We must remain alert to threats to areas already established.

Even before Dinosaur had been made safe, Mission 66 was introduced. Although well received and widely publicized, it got little attention from then on. Yet there were those who, while realizing something had to be done to take care of the increasing numbers of park visitors, felt concerned lest it turn out to be a vast construction program to the detriment of the parks. The

often repeated words of former National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury during the war and postwar period came to mind: "We have no money and we can do no harm."

With millions of dollars suddenly made available to carry out Mission 66 objectives, there was the question whether large construction plans would lead to abandonment of protective principles. Unless National Park Service leadership had vision and dedication to highest ideals, it could mean just that.

Mission 66 is well along and going full tilt, and we know now that the fears of those who expressed concern have been realized. Let's examine the record:

After the present Park Service administration came into office, in December, 1951, a change in policy became apparent. Wherever there was sufficient snow, for instance, the policy was to install mechanical ski lifts; and today, besides the classic example at Yosemite's commercial Badger Pass winter resort, as well as a skating rink in Yosemite Valley, Rocky Mountain has its Hidden Valley ski area, complete with lifts, skating rink, lounge, ski rental shop, infirmary, lunchroom and large parking area. Mount Rainier, Lassen Volcanic, Olympic and Sequoia, too, have ski resorts; yet not one of the parks needed to be so violated because many and adequate ski slopes are available outside.

Powerboating is another resort type amusement that has crept into certain national parks, notably Yellowstone, Everglades, Grand Teton, and Glacier. In these parks there should be, instead, only quiet concessionaire-operated launches for naturalist-conducted cruises. A large fishing-yachting resort of the kind that are a dime a dozen in Florida, has sprung up in the heart of Everglades, to accommodate the amusement seekers. This is in violation of the park act which directed that the area be kept unchanged. Two large marinas are to be built in Yellowstone, one of them now under construction. With lakes, rivers, and coastal waters everywhere open to all kinds of boating, there has been no justification to permit the few park lakes to become places for water sports.

In the early 1950's, the writer warned about the dangers of weakening the national policy. He advised that further introduction of mechanical ski facilities be stopped, and he urged that outboard motors and speedboats be removed from all national park waters. These warnings were ignored, and today, national park defenders are having to rescue the Park Service from the effects of its own shortsightedness:

1. We are having to oppose the efforts of powerboat enthusiasts to keep all of Yellowstone Lake open for their amusement. This amounts to an attempt on their part to deprive the Service of its authority to establish regulations.

2. We are having to oppose the demands of local commercial interests to turn the high wilderness of Olympic's Seven Lakes Basin into the "largest winter resort in the Northwest."

Had the National Park Service supported basic park principles through the past decade, our ability to prevent these commercial efforts would be assured. The fact is that had the Service made it clear that resort type amusements are a misuse of the national parks, these two problems might never have arisen. Having established the big fishing-yachting resort in Everglades, and for years having accommodated outboard motors and speedboats—even concessioner-operated ones in Yellowstone and other parks, and having encouraged and subsidized the development of the ski resorts already named, how can the Service expect the public to respect its request to close the southern arms of Yellowstone Lake and to prohibit establishment of

the proposed Seven Lakes Basin resort? The sad truth is that the Service, by allowing all these developments, has misled the public to regard national parks as centers for resort amusements. Little wonder, then, that pressures for more amusement facilities are building up.

Toward the beginning of Mission 66, one of the projects carried out in Yellowstone, for instance, was the clearing of the antiquated lodge and cabins on the south side of Yellowstone Canyon and construction of the much larger, more elaborate Canyon Village on the north side, back from the rim. A Park Service news release, issued at the time, quoted Director Conrad L. Wirth as saying that the Service had been authorized to move the old buildings because they were an intrusion on the natural scene. Did the director fail to realize that the new village was an even greater intrusion?

In the director's 1959 annual report, photographs on facing pages show the old village in Yosemite Valley and the site after removal of the buildings. What the pictures did not show was that much larger new buildings for the same concessioner had been built on the opposite side of the valley.

The editors of National Wildlands News are certain there is a way park visitors can be accommodated without cluttering the national parks with more and larger hotels and other facilities. After years of study of the problem, we have found what we consider a practical way to take care of increasing numbers of visitors, and at the same time save our fragile, irreplaceable national parks. There is nothing new about the plan. The Park Service actually is putting it into effect at Rocky Mountain National Park and is trying to do so at Mount Ranier, namely, to remove hotels from the heartlands of these two areas. We believe this should become general policy for the entire system of national parks and monuments.

Our recommendation is to adopt now a national policy, to be enforced by legislation, to build no more overnight accommodations or other facilities inside the heartlands of the parks, but as more are needed, and as existing ones become obsolete, to build new ones at the perimeters of the parks near the entrances, just inside, by concessioners or, better still, just outside by local private enterprise. (If by private enterprise just outside, there will be the added advantage of no cost to the taxpayer). The editors of the News further suggest that no more resort facilities or amusements of any kind be installed, and that existing ones be removed gradually, but as rapidly as possible.

This proposal, we believe, should appeal to everyone sincerely dedicated to the preservation of the national parks as a most precious heritage of us all. We therefore call on our friends and allies from coast to coast to join forces to win the people and Congress to support this proposal, and to help to bring it to reality with all haste before further harm is done.

Wheat Plan Slaps Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Jonesboro Sun of Jonesboro, Ark., carried a splendid editorial in its August 23, 1961, edition which I recommend to the Members of the House. I hope that

the Department of Agriculture will re-evaluate its decision to ship wheat into rice-producing areas for use in an emergency. Rice is ready to cook. It is easy to prepare. It is nutritious and a most delicious food. If grain is needed in the States that grow rice it would be easier and much more economical to set aside sufficient quantities of rice for this purpose. A program to deliver rice to critical areas of the whole country should be inaugurated to supplement wheat. There is need for both but between the two rice is much more adaptable for use in an emergency.

The Jonesboro Sun article follows:

WHEAT PLAN SLAPS RICE INDUSTRY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has proposed a plan to ship surplus wheat into Arkansas for storage in event of wartime need. The proposal has drawn a strong protest from ricegrowers.

It would seem that such a proposal gives little consideration to the ricegrower and to the product. The President has asked Congress for \$47.2 million to cover costs of the program, which would transfer 160 million bushels of wheat from midwestern storage areas to 191 cities which are listed as possible targets for atomic attack, including Little Rock and North Little Rock.

If the Government is sincere in the purpose of this expansion of storage facilities for grain, then it has selected the wrong product. Conversion of the wheat grain to an edible form would require much more time and processing than rice. Unless vast new processing facilities are constructed, the most you could expect to do with the wheat would be to convert it to flour for bread.

With rice the entire outlook would be different. It could be stored indefinitely in packages for immediate home consumption. Rice is the basic food for a large percent of the world's population. If we are talking about storing a food for use in case of an atomic attack, then what better food could you select than rice? During World War II people of many Far East countries, including American prisoners of war, lived on a diet of virtually nothing but rice for 4 years and longer.

Certainly we wouldn't recommend a diet of nothing but rice as long as there are other foods for variety, but if we are talking about food in an extreme emergency such as all-out war, then rice, which wouldn't have to be shipped anywhere as far as Arkansas is concerned, certainly would be far more beneficial than any other grain.

We would urge strongly that the U.S. Department of Agriculture take a second look at this proposal and by all means include rice in its storage plans—especially in the rice-producing areas of the Nation.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker in her next article, Eileen Shanahan looked into the money policy of the Kennedy administration and the role of the Council of Economic Advisers and Federal Reserve Board.

MONEY POLICY SUCCESS—SO FAR
(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The monetary policies advocated by the Kennedy administration in its first 6 months, its management of the Government debt, and its relations with the Federal Reserve System, remind some observers here of a famous old cartoon.

The panel showed a man who had fallen from a tall building who, as he hurtled earthward, called out to onlookers at lower floor windows: "I'm all right—so far."

For the administration and its money management policies, no one can yet say positively whether a tragic mess or a safe landing in a fire net lies beyond the picture. What is clear is that all those with direct responsibility—both in the administration and at the Federal Reserve Board—are determined that there will be a safe landing, if humanly possible. If they have to shift position a trifle to assure it, they will.

Much such shifting has already occurred—to the surprise of those who predicted nothing but open warfare between the administration and the "Fed."

Accommodations have been sought—and found. Consistent attempts have been made on both sides to distinguish between disagreements involving fundamental principles—of which there have, to date, been none—and those involving merely timing, magnitude, or narrow tactics.

HELLER, MARTIN VIEWS

A good example of the latter arose from the problem of long-term "structural" unemployment, and what to do about it.

Chairman Walter W. Heller, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, on successive days, gave their views on this subject to the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Dr. Heller, with page after page of statistics, sought to demonstrate that those who are unemployed because of fundamental changes in production patterns and other "structural" causes constitute an insignificant percentage of total unemployment. The jobless will be put back to work, he said, if the economy grows.

LONG-TERM PROBLEMS

Nonsense, Mr. Martin answered, in effect. There are very real long-term structural unemployment problems, and attempting to solve them just by raising overall economy activity will not only fail, but threaten to create inflation as well.

The battle lines appeared to be drawn. But instead, Mr. Martin accepted an invitation to a White House meeting at which a statement was drafted for President Kennedy—it was subsequently used as the basis for the answer to a press conference question—minimizing the differences in position on the unemployment issue between the administration and the Federal Reserve.

Both Mr. Martin and Dr. Heller spent the next several weeks publicly volunteering the view that the other fellow had a point.

The absence of dramatic conflict so far between the administration and the Federal Reserve appears to stem only in part from the real mutually held desire to avoid it, if honorably possible. Additional explanations can be found in personalities—and in the thesis that the division between the two was never so great as was imagined in some quarters.

KEY APPOINTMENTS

These two factors may even be interrelated. The key appointments made by President Kennedy in the money management field may be a reflection, as much as a cause, of a disposition on the part of the White House to work out money management problems in a manner satisfactory to the business and financial communities.

The key appointments have been three—Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, first of

all. Then, closer to the firing line, Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa. And finally George W. Mitchell as the first Kennedy nominee to the Federal Reserve Board itself.

If Mr. Mitchell, a Democrat and former Adlai Stevenson adviser in Illinois, was not the first choice of the conservative community—and he wasn't—he was also, as a vice president of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, far preferable to most of those who were rumored for the job.

As for Mr. Roosa, another old Federal man, his management of the Government debt has so far been beyond criticism by the financial community and, oddly, by easy money advocates as well.

Mr. Kennedy's Treasury inherited one of the most crowded debt maturity schedules in history from the Eisenhower administration and an intransigent Congress which refused to repeal the constricting 4¼ percent interest ceiling on Government bonds.

But in the face of this, and a need to borrow some new money, too, plus a commitment to a program of keeping longer-term interest rates relatively low until something close to full employment was restored, it has, nevertheless, not lost sight of the objective of lengthening the maturity dates of the Federal debt wherever possible.

Severe difficulties in the whole money management field may, of course, lie ahead. Not only is the recession clearly over—with all that implies about the possibility of inflation and too much boom—but the international economic situation has taken a troublesome turn.

BRITISH RATE IMPACT

With the British bank rate now at 7 percent, will an outflow of hot money from this country—and gold also—be resumed? Will the administration, its eye still on the highly unsatisfactory unemployment figures, willingly permit the Federal Reserve to push short-term interest rates up for international purposes?

How deeply does the White House still feel that the natural recovery-born rise in both short and long rates should be blunted by monetary policies? If it decides not to resist an interest rate uptrend, how long can it keep the congressional easy money advocates from nipping at its heels?

Will there be a conflict over continuation of operation nudge—the Federal Reserve's moderately successful attempt to hold short rates up and long rates down in the interest of reconciling domestic and international financial objectives?

What the Federal Reserve most fears at the moment in a judgment on the part of the administration that there is no need for restraint on growth until the economy is filled up to the brim in every compartment. The Federal Reserve can foresee a need to put on the brakes long before we get to that point.

But on the basis of the record to date, there appears to be considerable validity in this private comment of one Federal Reserve Board official:

"Of course we have differences with the administration. But you're making a bad mistake if you see this thing as an inevitable walk down toward doom as in 'High Noon.'"

Keeping the Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the recent tension in Berlin, we have

again turned our attention to the reserve strength we have in the National Guard. It is unfortunate that our interest in these units tends to slacken except in times of tension.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I want to insert an editorial from the August 28 issue of the Indianapolis Star:

KEEPING THE GUARD UP

The approach and development of the crisis in Berlin brought an interesting degree of reliance by the Department of Defense on the National Guard. Possibility of calling up Guard units was seriously discussed.

Air National Guard units across the country have been placed on an alert status, and some have been notified of call-up on October 1.

Currently there is much speculation in Army circles as to what can be done to enhance further the readiness of the Nation's many Guard units. Should they have three weeks of summer training instead of only two? Should their weekend assemblies and other armory drills be increased?

The National Guard has not always been regarded, during calmer periods, with the interest now being shown in a time of possible need. Several times since World War II there have been major efforts to reduce the strength of the Guard. Congress intervened. Even with Congress standing fast on that point, however, the Guard has felt the squeeze of the Bureau of the Budget and has been forced by fund limitations to curtail its training and school programs.

We hope the day will come—soon—when the Nation's defense planners will recognize more firmly the absolute need for these bodies of trained "citizen soldiers." They are needed because of the economic impossibility of maintaining standing Armed Forces of such size as to meet all possible military needs.

Indiana is, and should be, particularly sensitive to the problem because of its interest in the State's highly rated 38th Infantry Division and the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing. Both are outstanding military units and we are proud of them. They deserve support in fair weather as well as foul.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the administration ideas in taxes and tax reduction is the subject of the eighth in the Journal of Commerce series on the Kennedy economic program:

TAX REDUCTION ALMOST IN LIMBO

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Gurgle, gurgle, gurgle.

Was that the sound of next year's promised tax cut for upper-bracket taxpayers going down the drain?

Likely so, though there remain some in the administration who still cling to the hope that such a reduction can be recommended next January—along with a series of proposals to close alleged tax loopholes which will hurt some high bracket citizens more than a cut in the top rate would help them.

CUT NOT DISCUSSED

For the public record, of course, the administration is no longer talking about tax

reduction at all. Instead, President Kennedy has committed himself to a tax increase next year if the Federal budget will not balance without it.

But administration tax decisions are being made within the framework of three basic tenets of economic and fiscal theory which have now become quite clear and which have gained almost unanimous acceptance within the administration.

An examination of these tenets provides significant clues to what lies ahead. One of them is leftist, one is less and less controversial and one finds nearly unanimous acceptance in the business community. In that order, they are:

The administration believes that the level of Government expenditures and taxes during the late 1950's and up through last year exerted, overall, a depressing effect on the economy.

Either expenditures were too low or taxes were too high but, in any event, the budget came into balance—and, as such, exercised a neutral effect on the economy—at less than full employment levels of business activity. Changes in the relationship between Government income and outgo were needed, according to this view, so that the budget would balance precisely at full employment levels, run a surplus in good times and a deficit in bad.

The tax structure is too complex, cumbersome, and inequitable, with the result that speedy changes in tax rates to meet budgetary and economic stabilization needs have become all but impossible.

The old New Deal concept that the one and only way to enhance economic activity is to add to the incomes of consumers is wrong. Incentives for business—and individual businessmen—do work and create growth.

FULL EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

The administration has now "solved" the problem of a budget that balances when business activity is too slack. It has solved it through raising expenditures.

And President Kennedy's commitment to propose tax increases next year if the budget isn't balanced gives a pretty clear indication of the level of Government outgo which the administration has identified as a "full employment" budget which ought to be in balance—somewhere in the general neighborhood of \$92 billion or \$93 billion.

This is, of course, at the foreseeable rate of total economic activity. As the gross national product rises, the level of the full employment balanced budget can rise, too, according to the administration theory.

Yet, even in the face of the decision that next year's probable budget expenditures, well in excess of \$90 billion, meet the needs of economic stabilization policy, the administration's commitment to a simplified, more flexible, and—in its view—fairer tax system remains strong.

If it is at all possible to avoid raising the taxes of lower income citizens—a situation in which a simultaneous cut in top bracket rates would be politically impossible—it will propose a reduction in top bracket rates as the attractive aspect of a major tax reform bill.

How much real chance is there that budget expenditures will grow sufficiently little—or, conversely, the economy grow sufficiently much—for a tax increase to be avoided next year?

The answer is: a fighting chance, though budget outlays in some respects, seem almost out of control.

ESTIMATE TOO LOW

The budget estimate which the administration submitted to Congress as recently as last March for the fiscal year which ended on June 30 turned out to be more than \$1 billion too low when all the facts were known at the end of July. To be sure, a large por-

tion of the rise stemmed from defense procurement acceleration ordered by the Eisenhower administration.

The budget expenditure estimate of \$93 billion for next fiscal year—which some officials are using as a rough working assumption—is, for purposes of comparison, more than \$20 billion higher than the \$71.8 billion figure which curled former Treasury Secretary George Humphrey's hair in January 1957, 5 years ago.

Of that \$20 billion increase, about half can be attributed to the Eisenhower administration and half to the present one.

RISE NOT ENORMOUS

Surprisingly, however, when budget expenditures are seen in the context of the gross national product, the increase has not been enormous.

In fiscal 1955, the Eisenhower administration's lowest expenditure year, regular budget outlays amounted to 17 percent of the gross national product. Using an optimistic, but not outlandish, forecast of GNP for the current fiscal year of \$540 billion, Kennedy administration expenditures will amount to a shade under 17 percent of GNP.

What is possibly more surprising is the budget GNP for expenditures other than national security in 1955 and the current year. It is up, but not very much—from 6.3 percent in 1955 to 6.7 percent now.

One thing is certain. If the economy does grow sufficiently to balance a budget at \$93 billion or so next year, regardless of the reasons for the growth, those who would prefer to see a much reduced level of Federal spending are going to have more difficulty than ever in winning their case.

What Can I Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the El Capitan Citizen, of August 24, 1961:

WHAT CAN I DO?

Testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Edward Hunter, former OSS man and foreign editor from Europe, Africa and China said: "I have been watching developments under communism in other parts of the world and now I see exactly the same developments here in America."

According to Hunter, these developments include, "first of all, the penetration of our leadership circles by softening up, and creating a defeatist state of mind . . . liquidation of our attitudes on what we used to recognize as right and wrong, what we used to accept as absolute moral standards." We now confuse the crackpot Communist philosophy that everything changes, with true moral standards, says Hunter.

APATHY CAN KILL US

Hunter says too many Americans have the feeling that if we can just stall long enough, this situation will take care of itself. They couldn't be more wrong. An apathetic America is a dead America. Now is the time for action.

By now, some of you are saying, what can I do. The answer is plenty. You have influence, wherever you are. Within your family, your club, your community, you have

influence. Learn to speak up—politely, ever so politely. Learn the knack of polite contradictions.

And above all, remember that whenever you espouse anything that gives the Communists trouble, you can expect trouble from them and their Red-wing buddies.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

First, you must know your enemy. Read books, pamphlets, and newspapers that show the current Communist line and how to counteract it. You will soon learn to recognize it when it comes from the mouth of important people. In San Diego, there are numerous study clubs who examine the current Red line, and plan anti-Communist activities. Join one of these, or pursue the matter on your own.

Next, learn to write your Congressman, Senators, and other legislators. Every good Communist and crackpot is writing continuously. Your elected lawmakers can't serve you unless they know what you want. Make your opinions heard too.

These letters are extremely effective. For instance, Congressman BOB WILSON, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, said last week that "an aroused and indignant American public" killed the attempt to recognize Outer Mongolia. And how else could the administration know of the American public's indignation, unless it received letters or other communications from the individual citizens.

DON'T FORGET NEWSPAPERS

As long as you have pen and paper in hand, don't forget the "Letters to the Editor" column in your local newspaper. This is the most widely read section of the newspaper. Don't waste your time on useless or rabid criticism. Promote American ideas, broadcast the current Communist line to warn others, and, above all, be factual, informative, and polite.

Some newspapers dote on out-of-town letters to show wide circulation. Send letters even if they don't get printed. If the paper continuously gives prominence to the other type of letters, at least you will know the temper of those who are paying his bills for him.

Do not, under any circumstances, use the term "Communist" loosely. Remember, it is not enough to be against communism; you must promote America and American principles in order to succeed.

AID YOUR LEGISLATORS

Since the Communists have poured out so much time and effort to knock out the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, the time you give supporting these groups would be well spent. These committees are really our best weapons against subversion because they provide the documents and sworn testimony revealing Red espionage and penetration over the last 25 years.

Support anti-Communist legislation now on the books, such as the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Subversive Activities Control Act. These acts have crippled the Communist Party in the United States, and more acts of this type are needed to counteract some of the Supreme Court decisions. Support anti-Communist legislation when it is introduced. Let your Congressmen and Senators know you support these bills and similar legislation.

PATRONIZE AMERICAN FIRMS

Give your patronage to companies that advertise pro-American and anti-Communist magazines and newspapers. Support those advertisers who sponsor anti-Communist radio and TV programs. And write to the sponsors and let them know you are doing this. By the same token, withhold your patronage from firms backing left-

wingers and Red-wingers—and write to tell them why.

Give financial support to competent magazines, writers, speakers, and organizations fighting communism.

THEY'LL ATTACK YOU

And above all, remember whenever you start this work you are going to be attacked by Communist and their Red-wing gangs.

They won't meet the issue head-on by merely calling you anti-Communist. They will attack you personally, your business, your family. They will lie about you, smear your reputation, and try every despicable trick in the book to stop you.

For instance, one Lakeside man made it a habit to write letters to the editor exposing Communist chicanery. After a short while, he started receiving threatening phone calls in the middle of the night. He said he then asked the newspapers to give him a pen name. After that, he says the threats stopped.

Much of the attacks on you will be lies. Communists and their Red-wing dupes do not stick to the truth when they attack you. They work on the principle of the big lie—if you tell it often enough, people will begin to believe it.

NOT ENOUGH REDS

But remember, there aren't enough Communists or dupes to attack all red-blooded Americans. As the number of Americans increase, the amount of Communist pressure on each will decrease.

Our country started with a saying, "We must all hang together, or we shall surely hang separately."

And the same idea is true today.

The Berlin Crisis Can Be Made an Asset For Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the present Berlin crisis, the third such crisis provoked by the Russians, is a symbol of the ideological conflict between the new totalitarian dictatorship and the free, open society of the West. An editorial which appeared in the July 20 issue of the Washington Post made the point, "that even if the Berlin crisis subsides, the central challenge will remain."

Today's issue of the Washington Post carried a timely and penetrating analysis of the basic meaning of the Berlin crisis. That letter to the editor was written by Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., associate professor of American history, Fordham University, who takes the position that Berlin is not a weakness of the West, but rather it is one of the great strengths of the West because it is an opening to the heart of captive Europe. I commend this letter to the reading of those who prefer political action to military action in meeting the aggressive, imperial threats of Moscow. Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the letter to the editor:

Your perceptive editorial of July 20 wherein you remark "that even if the Berlin crisis subsides . . . the central challenge will

remain," is the occasion for this letter. I have also been motivated by President Kennedy's courageous speech of July 25 in which he stated that he is determined to abandon a merely negative type of foreign policy.

In this same talk the President was kind enough to invite the participation of his fellow Americans in forging a positive program for international affairs. My suggestions are as follows:

It seems to me that the tension now surrounding the Berlin question could be considerably lessened if Mr. Kennedy, instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline of December 31, would set an earlier deadline of his own. Since Moscow has chosen to raise the Berlin issue why should not Washington insist on the right of East Germany to self-determination in free elections? This was promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955.

And while our Chief Executive is on the question of freedom, he ought to press for similar rights for all the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. Their rights, too, have been guaranteed by the solemn treaties that have been consistently violated by the Communists since the close of World War II. Berlin, far from being our Achilles heel, is rather an opening to the heart of captured Europe. Freedom is indivisible, and the fate of Berlin is inseparably linked with that of Eastern Europe.

An international conference with or without Khrushchev, should be held not merely about Berlin, but about Germany and Eastern Europe as well. If the master of the Kremlin refuses to attend this conference, the West should resort to political warfare in an effort to change his mind. This could take the form of economic sanctions.

The fact of the matter is that the Communist bloc is much more dependent on trade than the West. Grain from the United States, factories from Britain, steel and ships from West Germany, are products that help build a strong Communist empire. I am advocating a complete embargo on East-West trade with concurrent explanations of Western aims by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This might well make Khrushchev think seriously about keeping his promises. The West cannot do less for freedom's sake.

Leo Cherne's remarks last month on the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt are pertinent to the current crisis, and are deserving of frequent quotation. He declared that: "If freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom (i.e., Europeans) are permitted to remain slaves."

HERBERT J. CLANCY, S.J.,

Associate Professor of American History, Fordham University.

NEW YORK.

Washington Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is not my regular practice to place in the RECORD the newsletters which I send to my constituents. In the past some of them have been put in the RECORD and I should like to insert my most recent newsletter in the RECORD as

the result of a letter which I have received, a letter which I also wish to have appear as a foreword to my newsletter, for I believe that there are some important points raised in it. The letter, from Mr. Emmet Layton, of St. Louis, and my newsletter follow:

LAYTON, LAYTON & ASSOCIATES,

St. Louis, Mo., August 14, 1961.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,

Congressman, Second District of Missouri, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: You will find enclosed an abstract from your July letter which we have taken the liberty of printing for a limited distribution to those who might not otherwise have received it. All these years we have enjoyed and thoroughly appreciated your reports without writing to express our sincere gratitude. But your July communication was so very outstanding that we are compelled to let you know how deeply it impressed, how truly it satisfied and how clearly it stated the problem which might well lie at the root of an increasing failure to communicate with each other.

It is with bewilderment that people find themselves surrounded by half truths and a distorted picture of their Nation, their environment and the very heart of what they have held most dear. Many of us are in an embattled position, forced to prove what should be considered self-evident.

The great creation which was—and is—the United States has something of a sacramental quality—an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The grace to be free and to share that freedom with others is being gradually eroded away to the point where the simple among us are confused, the mature are frustrated and the intellectuals are angry—and often mad.

Is it possible for your July letter to be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? It deserves the widest possible distribution—and we thank you again, most sincerely.

Very truly yours,

EMMET LAYTON.

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPRESENTING THE SECOND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, TOM CURTIS

JULY 1961.

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: The deeper I get into the major issues that face our country today, the more difficult I find it is to pass back information to you. Part of this difficulty arises from the fact that some of these issues are complicated, but I am satisfied that this is not the essence of the problem. I find from my question and answer sessions with groups ranging from high school students to golden age clubs that the people by and large are perfectly capable of understanding the issues of the day, even when they are a bit complex. In fact, politics can be fun if we conduct it on the level of reason and not of prejudice.

EXCHANGE OF IGNORANCE

A new definition of an expert is as follows: You are an expert when the reporters begin quoting you on subjects outside your field.

Indeed, it is a great temptation to discuss subjects about which you have only a smattering of knowledge. Few of us can resist this temptation, particularly when we are egged on. Furthermore, the less we know about a subject, the easier it is to make sweeping generalities about it; the more we know about a subject, the more cautious we are in making unqualified statements.

Today in America we are engaged in a great exchange of ignorance. Experts have not exercised self-discipline about popping off on subjects outside their specialized fields. All of us are alert to the sensational, and that which is most sensational is a sweeping generality.

LABELING

The housewife has learned a great deal about the merchandising art of packaging and labeling products. She has learned the truth of the ancient maxim that all that glitters is not gold and has become wary. We ordinary citizens are just becoming aware of the fact that ideas are being merchandised just like soap. We must become wary and look behind labels to see what the real product is. We must look behind the handsome face and cultured voice of the salesman, or the hero who endorses the product, at the product itself.

We also must be wary of the negative sale—the sale that downgrades the ideas of the competitor instead of pointing up the virtues of one's own ideas. Or, worse still, the negative sale that avoids all discussion of the ideas and resorts to a personal attack on the label and the salesman of the competing ideas.

CRITICISM OUT OF CONTEXT

The most sensational generalities arise from criticism out of context. This kind of criticism is most difficult to handle because the criticism itself may be accurate. Just as soon as you try to put the criticism in context by pointing out the favorable points in the problem, the criticizer comes back to retort, "Oh, then you are satisfied with the situation," which of course, is not the case at all.

HARVEST OF SHAME

Let me illustrate by an example one of hundreds of examples from which I could select. Many of you saw the CBS television "documentary" film of our itinerant farm laborers narrated by Edward Murrow. I know this because many of you wrote to me about it asking me about its accuracy.

This film was a prime example of criticism out of context. There is certainly a serious problem in the standard of living of our itinerant farm laborers. However, let us put the problem in context. It is not a new problem in America. It is not a neglected problem. A great deal has been done in the immediate past to get on top of this problem. It is a rapidly disappearing problem because of what the many people concerned with it, experts, have been doing about it. If Mr. Murrow wanted to show the problem in context, he would have gone to the experts to find out when the problem arose, what had been done about it, what was being done about it, and what the future prospects for eliminating the problem were. Furthermore, in context he would have pointed out that the problem existed nowhere in the world outside America, because it was not a problem of failure but a problem created by the success of our American system.

Our itinerant farmworkers are a social problem because of the contrast of their living conditions with the higher living conditions of almost everyone else around them. In Mexico, the living conditions of the American itinerant farm is so much higher than the general living conditions in Mexico that there is a 2- or 3-year waiting list to be permitted to enter the United States to become an itinerant farmworker.

Now, back to the beginning. Because I have tried to put the problem in context, does this mean I am satisfied with the progress we have made? Not at all. America thrives on criticism; that's one way we move ahead to improve our system.

FRUSTRATING THE COMMUNISTS

I once told a member of the Russian Embassy that in many respects the Russians were a great help to America. They were constantly on the alert to find things that were wrong in America, to pick at them, and try to build them into major issues that would damage America. However, America by and large is on the lookout for things that are wrong, and when things are brought

to our attention we go out to correct them. There is nothing like an astute critic, whatever his motives, to bring improvement.

The damage occurs, however, when we permit the Communists or anyone else to get away with criticism out of context. By treating a matter out of context we can destroy the essential goodness and the progress we have been making in an undue concentration on the flaw that we are seeking to eliminate. So Mr. Murrow's broadcast hurt to some degree the progress we were making in coping with the problem by treating the matter out of context. He hurt America by directing a personal criticism against our society by the title he selected, "Harvest of Shame." Indeed, there is no shame in the amazing progress America has made in the field of agriculture, freeing men and women for the first time in history from the animal drudgery this activity has demanded. There is no shame in the contrast we have created between the itinerant farm laborers and the rest of our people unless we are to say that whenever any group moves ahead of another group it is shameful to have a lower group. The shame would exist if this were a problem that we were not doing something about. But we are doing something about it, and Murrow had to search pretty hard to get the pictures he did without showing the progress being made.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Most of the criticism directed against our systems of promoting health, education, and welfare has been badly out of context. If we wish to criticize in context, let us start out with this basic and irrefutable statement—our society has the best health, education, and welfare of any society in history by a considerable margin. Furthermore, we have attained this high standard by preserving, indeed I would state by placing emphasis on, personal freedoms.

There has been a din of exchanges of bits of ignorance in this area. Let me point up one for illustration. Russia has a superior system of education. What is the truth? Russia has over half her children in rural areas, where there is no rural electrification, no farm-to-market roads, and very few schoolhouses. Russia has compulsory education in rural areas of only 4 years. Does this mean that we can learn nothing from Russia's quality educational programs? Of course not, we can learn from them and any society, but it certainly does mean that we should not seriously think for a minute of exchanging our educational system for Russia's.

It has been said that people over 65 have higher medical bills than any other age group in our society. This is true, and it is out of context because older people also have lower costs in every other area of their budgets than any other age group in our society—rent, clothing, food, recreation and bearing the cost of rearing and educating children. It has been said that older people have lower incomes from salaries and wages than any other age group in our society. This is true, and it is also out of context because older people have more liquid assets and more savings than any age group in our society. Does this mean that we have no problem in the health cost of the aged? By no means, but on further analysis it shows that the problem of health costs is not peculiar to any age group. We all have the problem and it will be met, and is being met through more health facilities and more and better health insurance programs.

It has been stated that 18 million Americans go to bed hungry. This is true, and it is irresponsibility out of context. The statistic related to balanced diets and had nothing to do with financial ability to have balanced diets. The teenage group apparently has the least desirable balanced diet of

any group in our society. Doctors are telling Americans to eat less and more selectively, and not eat more. If you follow your doctor's advice, you become one of the 18 million Americans going to bed hungry.

All of this criticism out of context bears great danger. 1. It may cause us to damage or even destroy a system which has produced the highest standards ever attained by any society, in our narrow concentration on the flaws we are seeking to correct. 2. It certainly does cause us damage in the eyes of the world which is hard put to believe that America's standards in health, education, and welfare are as high as they are.

RACIAL PROBLEMS

Probably there has been more criticism of America out of context in the field of race relations than any other area. So out of context has the criticism been that it shocks people to realize that in this area, too, nowhere in the world has there ever been such high standards of race relations as exist in the United States today.

A great deal of criticism is constantly being directed against the United States from India on the subject of race relations. Any student of India, or even a person with half a knowledge of India is aware of the fact that no people or no nation has such a poor record or standard of race relations.

Much is made of U.S. race relations in respect to the U.S. prestige in the new nations of Africa. Has anyone listened to those who have made a study of race relations between the various groups of native Africans? I am somewhat knowledgeable of the Caribbean nation, Haiti, which is entirely Negro. Both race and class relations in Haiti are at such a low standard that to relate them to the problems in the United States is almost meaningless.

CUBA, LAOS, WEST BERLIN AND FOREIGN POLICY

The exchange of ignorance that constantly goes on in the field of our foreign policy is the most shocking of all to one who digs into these matters. It does not shock our people generally, because they have been kept in the dark about even the rudiments of facts. Statements that are fantastically false are treated with the same response that carefully weighed statements receive.

The following is only a glimmer of what I am referring to. In my judgment, the essence of the Cuban situation lies in sugar. Under U.S. policy established and maintained over 50 years ago, Cuba has been encouraged to become and remain essentially a one-crop economy—sugar. All nations for defense reasons have to maintain a sure supply of sugar. Not to take care of our sweet tooth, but to manufacture industrial alcohol and other ingredients needed for ammunition, rubber, and other war materials. The U.S. sugar policy rests in this area. For 11 years the Congress has had no real hearings or open debates on sugar policy. When the Sugar Act has been extended, as it has from time to time, the issues have been decided behind closed doors by a very small group of Congressmen, Government officials, and people outside Government.

I have made many public statements on the need for the Congress, representing the people, to learn about sugar, and as they learn about sugar to inform our people about the issues surrounding it. By doing this, we probably will find the proper answer to Cuba, both for our benefit and for the benefit of the Cuban people.

HIDING INFORMATION FROM THE PEOPLE

I have concluded that the major issue facing the United States today is getting public debate on a higher plane . . . a plane that sets forth the proper rules of debate . . . a plane that permits those who have studied a field to be heard and the facts they have adduced to be weighed. This

means that we must call the House to order and still the student voices of ignorance which shut out the voices of scholarship and reason. I have the greatest faith in the wisdom of the American people if they are permitted to hear honest and forthright debate on the issues that face us.

America Must Return to Idealism if We Are To Be Worthy of World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the role of any leader is to lead and this cannot be done by waiting to determine the popular course or by being afraid of incurring criticism. I am afraid the present administration lacks the determined will to reach a decision on how to meet the challenge of communism because administration policymakers seem to be waiting for some miracle to happen which would give an answer that will meet with worldwide popularity. This is not the way the United States can command respect, nor indeed, be worthy of world leadership. Our decision in Berlin, in Cuba, in every other area of the world where freedom is threatened by the Communist conspiracy must be based on the idealism upon which our country was founded. When we find the courage to clearly state our position on the side of freedom, we will command the respect, and eventually the loyalty of the great majority of the people of the world. To do less is to play into the hands of the Kremlin and give them a continued advantage in winning the battle for men's minds. The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, and the editorial from the Wall Street Journal, point up the issue and how we can rebuild American prestige:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]
UNITED STATES FAILING ON WORLD LEADERSHIP—THOUGH NATION IS STILL HIGHLY REGARDED, ITS ROLE AS HARMONIZER IS CALLED WEAK

(By David Lawrence)

Some impressions formed in Europe during nearly 2 months of observation there are presented here today. They are derived from many frank conversations with heads of government, foreign ministers and well-informed editors of important newspapers abroad.

There is, first of all, a high regard for the United States. Its prestige has never really been impaired, though disappointments in the postwar years have been noted and editorial criticism at times has been severe.

Basically the United States is looked to for leadership, which is somehow expected to be perfect in form and substance and method. The moment American policy seems at variance with what highly placed officials in other countries think it should be, they do not hesitate to express themselves about it. Too often the newspapers reflect this dis-

satisfaction, and the episodes then become magnified beyond their true importance.

There is, however, fundamentally a difference in viewpoint. European nations are struggling for economic equilibrium and ways and means of satisfying the pressures for more and more welfare programs for their growing populations. They are not as strong by any means as the United States, nor have they its potential resources. They have drifted into sheer dependence on America for military, if not economic, support.

As for a big war, it is feared but everyday life doesn't seem to be modified because of that fear. Normal processes of development continue, and officials, though worried, seem confident that war will be avoided.

If this correspondent brings back, however, one single impression about the whole situation, it is that America is not furnishing the leadership it should in the world today.

It's too bad that President Kennedy has not himself heretofore had the benefit of actual experience in international affairs. Two years from now he will be doing perhaps many of the things he ought to be doing today. For he will learn the hard way that trying to harmonize differences with the Western allies is a frustrating task and results in the end in policies that represent a common denominator of weakness rather than strength.

President Wilson during World War I gave an example of leadership that might well be repeated today. He did not worry too much about what his allies said or thought about the large programs of policy that he believed should be formulated for the postwar years. He spoke out directly and forthrightly. He didn't feel that he had to consult allies on how each paragraph of his speeches or statements should be worded.

Today there is a conflict between materialism and idealism, between adherence to principle and a readiness to barter with the Communists—to buy peace at the expense of principle. The Western allies are divided in their concepts of what ought to be done about East Germany, for instance, and are allowing themselves to be pushed around on the subject of human rights in East Germany as well as in East Berlin. The United States gives an impression of timidity in what is euphemistically described as caution and restraint. But it actually is furnishing to Nikita Khrushchev—as happened with Hitler—the feeling that the Western alliance is not as strong as it is cracked up to be.

Outwardly, some lipservice is being paid to the cause of reunification of Germany. But, under the surface, there is fear of such a contingency. Memories of the war have not vanished in Europe, though American policy toward Japan shows how wartime feeling can be superseded by a new sense of friendship for a former enemy.

The Bonn Government is a free and democratic government. Like the Weimar Republic of the 1920's, it needs help and encouragement. West Germany needs to be reunited with East Germany. Otherwise, West Germany will be repossessed someday by the same kind of militaristic groups that gave Hitler his chance to rule.

Keeping Germany divided is dangerous to the peace of the world. President Kennedy should speak out in this cause, even if the Western allies do not dare to do so publicly. They should already know the spirit of revenge that can be built up inside a defeated country. And they should know, too, that some strong voice of leadership must emerge today if the Berlin problem is to be put into its proper perspective.

Mr. Kennedy's plea for a reunified Germany would not be applauded publicly

today by the heads of government in Western Europe nor by some of the politicians. Public opinion within their countries isn't ready for it. So American spokesmen must lead in this cause. It takes a rare courage to speak out and lay before the world the basis of an enduring peace and to strive to get world opinion behind such a program.

If the Weimar Republic had been supported in the 1920's by the West, with financial and economic programs, there wouldn't have been a Hitler or a Second World War.

The Russian people don't want war, but they don't know that the way is being prepared for it by their own misguided rulers. They are not being told. The true voice of America that can help prevent a world war and insure peace has not yet been heard.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

POWER AND OPINION

Twenty-four "uncommitted" countries will meet this week in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, to express their opinions on world affairs. The Soviets don't seem especially interested, but Washington is waiting rather anxiously to hear what the "neutrals" think about Berlin.

What accounts for this sharp difference in attitude? Soviet disinterest is explained by the fact that the nations which will assemble at Belgrade are weak, and weakness does not command Mr. Khrushchev's respect. Moreover, he doesn't take the "uncommitted" tag seriously. In his brutal view, the world is split into Communist and non-Communist camps; so-called neutrals are merely those against whom the full weight of Soviet power is not yet committed. Their opinions are of no importance.

The United States, on the other hand, has long placed great importance on showing a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. And properly so. We would, if we could, have every nation understand why we act.

Harsh as it may seem, Khrushchev's view of the world—as the arena of struggle between two great powers—is more realistic. Small, weak, and backward nations cannot deeply influence the cold war. Indeed, their independence is a result of the West's power to check the ambitions of the East. The fact is, the U.S. commitment to opposing communism permits their posture of non-commitment.

Yet, paradoxically, the United States gets little but criticism for its pains. Part of the explanation of this is that others do not understand, or refuse to admit, that their own rights flow from the rights we uphold. If the world had to count on the Soviets to protect the right of self-determination, it would soon see the blessings of U.S. self-assertion.

But the heaviest blame for neutralist buffeting of U.S. policy falls on ourselves; we invite it. While the Soviets stand stony-faced and quick to punish those who cross them, Washington seems only too willing to try to please everyone. It even takes the "uncommitted" at face value, crediting them with a special place above the cold war battle that makes them somehow more "moral" and peace-loving than the fully committed antagonists. Yet the more influence they gain over U.S. policy, the more they must scorn a great power that does not know its own mind.

No one can argue that the United States should be indifferent to the opinions of others. But if the neutrals cannot see how their self-interest coincides with our interest in safeguarding freedom, their blindness does not excuse our paralysis. The danger of placing the world's good opinion before all else is that, when other disapprove, we may become powerless to do what we must.

**Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy
Economic Programs—XI**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Eileen Shanahan looks into the policy of the new administration toward American business abroad in the ninth of the articles in the *Journal of Commerce* series. This appeared on August 3:

**KENNEDY POLICY SERVING TO SPUR BUSINESS
ABROAD**

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—What's good for American business abroad is good for America.

This sweeping statement, which has not, in fact, been made in precisely so many words by any member of the Kennedy administration, nevertheless comes pretty close to expressing the viewpoint now held in Government circles.

An outstanding exception to it, of course, can be found in the administration's unsuccessful attempt to impose immediate taxes on all overseas operations of U.S. companies in industrialized nations and even on some activities—construed to be tax avoidance “gimmicks”—in underdeveloped countries.

But looking at the total picture, it has become clear in 6 months of the New Frontier that the Government recognizes that it needs business help—and, as a consequence, needs to help business—if American objectives around the globe are to be achieved.

NO MAJOR SHIFT

This attitude does not represent a major shift from the views and policies of the Eisenhower administration, although a case can be made that there has been some intensification of the partnership-with-business policy.

It does, however, involve—and this point has largely been missed in the public commentary on the subject—a very decided evolution from the attitude of the Truman administration, which entertained few thoughts concerning the role of private enterprise in development of the underdeveloped world.

The administration's partnership concept of the solution to overseas development has been made clear in a number of ways.

PRIVATE ROLE

President Kennedy has said that of the \$13 billion needed in Latin America for success of the Alliance for Progress, half must come from private sources.

The foreign aid bill now making its way through Congress contains a broad array of guarantees against loss on overseas private investment.

The Export-Import Bank, breaking a policy of 30 years' standing, offered a program of insurance against credit risks on short-term export transactions and then in the face of protests from the U.S. insurance industry, offered to let the insuring be done privately on a sort of subcontract arrangement, if the details can be worked out.

RISKS INVOLVED

The Government's program of assistance to business in establishing overseas operations is not, of course, without its risk of Government interference of a sort which business may not like. The official State Department document explaining the Kennedy

administration's new foreign aid proposal contains an explicit warning on this point.

“To the degree that special governmental incentives or financing devices are employed for the objective of enlisting private American business in the public purpose of assisting economic growth in less developed countries. The businesses that use them are engaging in a public service, not merely a private one. The private businesses affected take on a special trust and subject themselves to the imposition of conditions.”

There have been no public reports, so far at least, of any Government attempt to impose “conditions” at which any business firm has seriously balked. But the potential for conflict is present.

The administration is known to feel strongly, for example, that equity ownership in American companies should be opened to citizens of the host countries and that every effort should be made to employ local personnel in managerial and other skilled positions.

The extent to which the Government might attempt to impose its views on the type of facility to be erected abroad, and the locale, against the objections of the American firm involved, is not clear.

Ever since the Cuban confiscations of American property and the public disorders in the Congo, however, American firms have been increasingly disposed to seek Government advice on location and timing over their overseas investments, and to take it.

CLEAR PICTURE EMERGES

As for the other major aspect of Government policy toward international business activities—trade policy—a clear, though not absolutely unmixed, picture is emerging.

The administration is committed to a program of freer trade, and while its proposed solution to the textile problem—creation of a worldwide quota system, for the first time, on a manufactured product—was viewed in some quarters as a retreat from free trade concepts, the general view among free trade advocates was that it represented the only feasible solution in view of the very difficult domestic and international political problems involved.

President Kennedy's action in remanding to the Tariff Commission for further investigation the glass, ceramic tile, and baseball glove cases was not only a landmark decision but a hint of things to come, as well.

BROADER STUDY ASKED

In his letter to the Commission, Mr. Kennedy instructed it to examine factors far beyond the mere statistics of domestic production and volume of imports, which, under present law, provide the basis for most of the Commission's recommended increases in tariffs, including these three.

The President told the Commission to look into the possibility that one or more of these industries were losing their domestic markets because they have engaged in monopolistic marketing restrictions, been laggard about making advances in production technology, or simply held their prices too high.

Standards of this sort are expected to be recommended for inclusion in next year's major overhaul of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Meanwhile, the incoming Chairman of the Tariff Commission itself, Ben Dorfman, is an advocate of the classic free-trade position.

Pressures for protectionism will, of course, continue, including demands from the politically potent farm bloc, which may obtain the backing of Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

FINDING NEW MARKETS

Meanwhile, the Government—notably the Commerce Department—is taking more and more steps to help American business find overseas markets.

The Department is expected to announce shortly a reorganization of its Bureau of

Foreign Commerce, which will separate the Export Promotion Branch from the licensing and economic functions and enlarge promotion activities at the same time.

Although administration plans to speed and simplify export licensing procedures have so far achieved only limited success, the effort is still being made. And the Commerce Department, after a couple of early goofs, has been able to follow through on Secretary Luther H. Hodges' pledge to see that export licenses, once granted, will not be withdrawn.

Aid to Education Legislation

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have hoped during the entire session that soundly conceived education legislation could be considered and enacted by the House this year, the situation with which we are presented today is extremely disappointing.

Instead of a carefully considered bill called up for debate under normal procedures, we are confronted this afternoon with a hastily drafted piece of legislation brought to the floor under the seldom-used Calendar Wednesday procedure. No copies of the bill were even available until Monday. No hearings were held to consider the entirely new feature relating to school construction which the bill contains. No report from the Education and Labor Committee on the bill was available for study until we reached the floor of the House at noon today, just minutes before we were expected to cast our votes on the measure. No reasonable opportunity was given to file minority views to the committee report. No effort was even made to secure a rule from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a slipshod and haphazard way of considering legislation which simply cannot be condoned. I am disappointed and discouraged that the administration and the leadership in the House have allowed a matter of such grave importance as the adequate education of our young people to come to this.

In the past, I have supported the National Defense Education Act, and I feel very strongly that it should be extended. I have supported the impacted areas program and it, too, should be continued. A year ago I supported President Eisenhower's efforts to secure enactment of a school construction program, and I continue to believe that the Federal Government can play an effective role in providing help in this area. I am in complete sympathy with the aims of Representative GREEN's bill, H.R. 8900, dealing with assistance to institutions of higher education.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am definitely opposed to the procedure which is being attempted here today, and I shall vote against consideration of H.R. 8890 in this manner. I sincerely hope that this

effort to bring to bill to the floor today will be defeated and that as a result an opportunity to carefully analyze and evaluate the administration's latest proposals will be available to us. Only in this way can those who are sincerely concerned with the Nation's educational problems insure themselves against the adoption of a hastily conceived and completely untried device for meeting the school construction problem.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the windup article of the *Journal of Commerce* series on the Kennedy economic programs undertakes a look into the future as Eileen Shanahan attempts to outline what can be expected in the future from the current administration. This final article, which appears below, was published on August 4:

DOMESTIC PROGRAM SEEN MORE DRASTIC:
KENNEDY'S 1962 PLANS IN MAKING
(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—Any President has only about 3 years to get his domestic program through Congress.

Regardless of whether he is in office for a year beyond that time, or another 5 years—or, as in the case of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, another 9—his relations with Congress seem inevitably to deteriorate to a series of petty wrangles which, in the absence of any fundamental change in domestic or international conditions, effectively block enactment of any but truly essential legislation and authority to continue existing programs.

RECORD IS LONG

The historical record which documents this assertion is long. And the 3-year phenomenon, while never a subject of much comment among academicians or anyone else outside of government, is almost universally accepted by the inner circle of skilled tacticians of both parties who really run the Congress.

President Kennedy, as much a student of history in his way as a Truman or a Churchill, is doubtless aware of it, too.

The Kennedy administration has, in a certain sense, thrown away its first year, so far as enactment of bold new programs is concerned.

While much of the legislation it has been backing—successfully for the most part—seems on the radical side from the point of view of the business community, it has not, in fact, been very new.

MANY OLD IDEAS

Instead, its major legislative proposals have embodied ideas which have been kicking around among Democrats and their friends for years—many of which actually passed Congress during the Eisenhower ad-

ministration, only to run into a Presidential veto which could not be overridden.

Among the items which fall into this category are the program of assistance to chronic unemployment areas and inauguration of Government supports for middle-income housing. Even many of the tax reform proposals and the administration's proposed long-term authorization of foreign aid nearly got through Congress in years past.

If truly new domestic programs are to be enacted during the Kennedy years, they are going to have to be proposed next year. Otherwise, the clock may have run out.

NEW APPROACHES WEIGHED

A great many drastic new approaches are under consideration, including an attempt to grasp the nettle of coordinating transportation policy, some better means of dealing with strikes affecting the national security, coordinated treatment of the development of metropolitan areas and of natural resources, and a vast array of welfare programs, many of which would directly increase business payrolls.

Just how new and how sweeping any of these administration programs may be—and whether they will actually be proposed at all—awaits decisions which have not yet been made and may not be, for the most part, until next January.

CONTROVERSY IN MAKING

Several things are clear, however, for one thing, the ideas under study are far from noncontroversial, even within the administration itself. And a fundamental controversy lying behind the individual controversies is asserting itself more and more—can and should new domestic programs, nearly all of which will cost money, be enacted when enormous budgetary strains are being imposed by the international situation?

There are those in high positions within the administration who agree with most Republicans and businessmen that many of the planned new programs can be postponed until the Nation's checkbook shows a more comfortable balance.

Two other significant points concerning the present administration's attitudes and tactics emerge from an examination of its record in its first 6 months.

COMPROMISES NEEDED

It takes a pretty unemotional approach to the compromises that must be made in the process of achieving its legislative objectives and, in the process, frequently winds up with half a loaf. Whether it might win the whole loaf if it were less flexible—or, conversely would lose all—is a matter of bitter controversy among the administration's own best friends.

An example of this can be found in the minimum wage measure which went through Congress this year. In a tactical maneuver to gain the necessary margin of votes for passage of the bill, the administration agreed to exclusion from coverage of the very group of workers about whom organized labor and "liberal" everywhere had been most distraught—laundry employees.

President Kennedy has clearly decided that his international programs—military and economic—deserve the topmost priority in his battles with Congress. If support is to be found for their enactment in substantially the form he wants, he cannot permanently alienate any major sector of the American public—including business. He knows this.

This fact of life will serve to temper radicalism in the administration's proposals in the years ahead.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.